

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 9848. A bill amending the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 9849. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 9850. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation provided for Government officers and employees by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 9851. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to require Federal grand and petit jurors to take an oath of allegiance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 9852. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to exempt therefrom any railroad which operates wholly within a State if 95 percent or more of its passenger revenues are derived from intrastate transportation of passengers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 9853. A bill to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 9854. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," approved June 26, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 9855. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 9856. A bill amending section 3 of Public Law No. 134, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 9857. A bill to grant certain benefits provided for veterans of World War II to persons on active service with the Armed Forces during the military, naval, and air operations against the forces of North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. Con. Res. 292. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 3137; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 293. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings held before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. Res. 873. Resolution providing for the payment of certain additional charges for telephone and telegraph service furnished Members of the House of Representatives during the fiscal year 1950; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. Res. 875. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Re-

port No. 3138; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 9858. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. W. A. Kettlewell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 9859. A bill for the relief of Chikako Shishikura Kawata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois:

H. R. 9860. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida E. Horton; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 9861. A bill for the relief of Ciro Panariello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 9862. A bill for the relief of Joseph Saganich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH:

H. R. 9863. A bill for the relief of Man Foon Tow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1950

(Legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, hope of the souls that seek Thee, strength of the souls that find Thee, pushed and pressed by grave questions and vexing problems we would bow, first of all, at this daily altar dedicated to the far look. Before our eyes may there tower those lofty and eternal virtues that outlast the strident noises of any day.

The world about us is full of wild commotion, the clamor of the violent, the dark deeds of the ruthless and the agony of uncounted hosts of Thy children, haunted by nameless dread and ground in the dust of tyranny. We cannot adequately face such a world and make our humble contribution to the healing of its tangled, tragic state unless our faith in Thy power to make even the wrath of man praise Thee and in the ultimate victory of Thy purpose is kept untarnished.

"Lord, in this hour of tumult,  
Lord, in this night of fears;  
Keep open, O keep open,  
Our eyes, our hearts, our ears."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name.  
Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MAGNUSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 5, 1950, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9827) to provide revenue by imposing a corporate excess profits tax, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 105) authorizing the appointment of a committee to attend the general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to be held in Australia or New Zealand.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 483. An act to extend the time limit within which certain suits in admiralty may be brought against the United States; and

H. R. 2365. An act for the relief of the city of Chester, Ill.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from the close of business December 14 through the remainder of 1950.

#### MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. CHAVEZ, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate on Thursday and Friday of the present week.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Anderson	Hoey	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Myers
Bricker	Hunt	Neely
Butler	Ives	Nixon
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Kefauver	Pepper
Chapman	Kem	Robertson
Chavez	Kerr	Russell
Clements	Kilgore	Saltanostall
Connally	Knowland	Schoepel
Cordon	Langer	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Leahy	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Long	Stennis
Eastland	Lucas	Taft
Eaton	McCarran	Taylor
Ellender	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McFarland	Thye
George	McKellar	Tydings
Gillette	McMahon	Watkins
Gurney	Magnuson	Wherry
Hayden	Malone	Wiley
Hendrickson	Maybank	Williams
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a representative of the United States to the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed as a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent by leave of the Senate as a delegate of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Small Business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

CREREDENTIALS

Mr. WATKINS presented the credentials of WALLACE F. BENNETT, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Utah, a Senator from that State, for the term beginning January 3, 1951, which

were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF UTAH,  
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1950, WALLACE F. BENNETT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Utah a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1951.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, J. Bracken Lee, and our seal hereto affixed at Salt Lake City, this 28th day of November A. D. 1950.

J. BRACKEN LEE,  
Governor.

By the GOVERNOR:  
[SEAL] HEBER BENNION, Jr.,  
Secretary of State.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD, without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Henryk Oselka from a report relating to the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, transmitted to the Senate on March 15, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Maria Tome Da Silva Lawyer from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the National Association of State Aviation Officials, signed by A. B. McMullen, executive secretary, Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 1175, to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances

essential for forest-fire-control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the League of Women Voters of the United States, Washington, D. C., signed by Mrs. John G. Lee, president, relating to increased tax rates and credit regulations; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the sixth annual conference of the Alaska Moose Association, at Palmer, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation to abolish fish traps in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the sixth annual conference of the Alaska Moose Association, at Palmer, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation granting statehood to Alaska; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Clarence P. Keating, of Seward, Alaska, praying for the enactment of legislation granting statehood to Alaska; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. NEELY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 209) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 2587) thereon.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—EXECUTIVE BRANCH PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it has been the practice of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures of some years standing to submit monthly personnel reports as certified officially by the several executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government. The last such report submitted before the recess was for the month of July.

As chairman of the committee I submit a table consolidating the reports for August and September which were compiled during the recess, and also the regular report for the month of October, which is compiled as of today. In accordance with standing practice I request that these consolidated tables, a statement prepared by me, and the regular report be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables, statement, and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Consolidated personnel report for August and September with July comparisons

Department or agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch				Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch			
	July	August	September	Increase (+) or decrease (-)	June	July	August	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Total.....	1,985,139	2,062,900	2,096,821	+111,682	\$562,653	\$540,227	\$607,170	+\$44,517
1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment.....	1,205,739	1,203,470	1,192,826	-12,913	347,796	334,178	354,171	+6,375
2. National Military Establishment.....	779,400	859,430	903,995	+124,595	214,857	206,049	252,999	+38,142
Within the National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	1,759	1,783	1,821	+62	732	685	763	+31
Department of the Army.....	320,964	367,582	395,849	+74,885	86,760	78,067	101,897	+15,137
Department of the Air Force.....	156,737	168,128	173,422	+16,685	43,644	42,341	50,900	+7,256
Department of the Navy.....	299,940	321,937	332,903	+32,963	83,721	84,956	99,439	+15,718

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period July through September 1950 and comparison of July and September and pay for period June through August 1950 and comparison of June and August

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)					Personnel				
	June	July	August	Comparison of June and August		July	August	September	Comparison of July and September	
				Increase	Decrease				Increase	Decrease
<b>Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):</b>										
Agriculture.....	\$23,261	\$22,397	\$24,799	\$1,538		85,464	84,923	78,607		6,857
Commerce <sup>1,2</sup> .....	19,089	16,401	18,389		\$700	56,169	57,447	56,330	161	
Interior.....	18,778	18,728	20,091	1,313		65,551	64,733	61,627		3,924
Justice.....	9,450	9,443	10,049	599		26,717	26,683	26,613		104
Labor.....	2,180	1,963	2,035		145	6,033	6,070	6,151	118	
Post Office.....	131,202	129,805	130,360		842	495,888	493,765	492,560		3,328
State.....	8,216	7,992	7,892		624	24,326	24,314	24,720	394	
Treasury.....	29,790	26,970	31,317	1,527		87,586	86,827	86,734		852
<b>Executive Office of the President:</b>										
White House Office.....	143	149	162	19		327	341	345	18	
Bureau of the Budget.....	266	247	273	7		521	513	513		8
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	17	16	20	3		68	64	64		4
National Security Council <sup>4</sup> .....	9	7	11	2		17	16	16		
National Security Resources Board.....	177	178	222	45		369	384	431	62	
Council of Economic Advisers.....	20	22	23	3		35	37	36	1	
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion.....	2	2	2			5	5	5		
<b>Postwar agencies:</b>										
Displaced Persons Commission.....	97	98	104	7		262	283	289	27	
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	1,688	1,580	1,641		47	4,663	4,684	4,725	62	
Motor Carrier Claims Commission.....	11	12	11			20	18	18		2
Office of the Housing Expediter.....	920	909	956	36		2,579	2,510	2,501		78
Philippine Alien Property Administration.....	45	8	9		36	57	55	56		1
Philippine War Damage Commission.....	326	178	147		179	506	483	464		42
War Claims Commission.....	40	32	25		15	90	92	100	1	
<b>Independent agencies:</b>										
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	57	57	60	3		497	504	555	58	
Atomic Energy Commission.....	1,999	1,881	2,103	134		5,052	5,052	5,035		17
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	265	243	290	25		620	616	593		27
Civil Service Commission.....	1,218	1,092	1,203		15	3,404	3,420	3,442	38	
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	65	61	66	1		129	126	126		3
Federal Communications Commission.....	538	534	503		35	1,276	1,250	1,234		42
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	402	383	421	19		1,067	1,078	1,077	10	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	188	178	194	6		327	326	324		3
Federal Power Commission.....	311	293	323	12		738	722	717		21
Federal Security Agency <sup>5</sup> .....	10,227	9,051	10,206		21	32,970	33,048	33,676	706	
Federal Trade Commission.....	304	280	315	11		646	632	626		20
General Accounting Office.....	2,869	2,585	2,800		69	7,805	7,791	7,800		5
General Services Administration.....	6,028	6,548	7,266	1,238		26,095	26,150	26,142	47	
Government Printing Office.....	2,524	2,537	2,795	271		7,115	7,116	7,115		
Housing and Home Finance Agency <sup>6</sup> .....	4,801	4,778	4,887	86		13,673	13,580	14,344	671	
Indian Claims Commission.....	7	7	7			10	10	10		
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	860	802	877	17		2,087	2,075	2,052		35
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	2,486	2,360	2,593	107		7,446	7,456	7,340		106
National Capital Housing Authority.....	87	82	89	2		316	316	318	2	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	3	7	7	4		21	19	18		3
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission.....	24	54	55	31		233	235	203		30
National Gallery of Art.....	87	82	89	2		331	322	302		29
National Labor Relations Board.....	591	504	549		42	1,362	1,356	1,395	33	
National Mediation Board.....	68	66	63		5	128	129	124		4
Panama Canal.....	3,554	3,240	3,008		546	19,823	19,977	20,377	554	
Railroad Retirement Board.....	705	674	725	20		2,297	2,240	2,200		97
Reconstruction Finance Corporation <sup>7</sup> .....	1,899	1,788	1,942	43		4,600	4,584	3,603		997
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	442	426	463	21		1,005	1,002	1,000		5
Selective Service System.....	512	733	1,324	812		5,037	6,166	6,524	1,487	
Smithsonian Institution.....	192	184	200	8		554	545	538		16
Tariff Commission.....	110	100	103		7	218	217	214		4
Tax Court of the United States.....	65	56	53		12	121	122	121		
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	4,229	3,942	4,542	313		14,006	14,152	14,387	381	
Veterans' Administration.....	54,382	51,289	55,647	1,265		187,468	186,150	185,654		1,814
Soldiers' Home.....		114	165	165			734	735		
<b>Total, excluding National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>347,796</b>	<b>334,178</b>	<b>354,171</b>	<b>9,715</b>	<b>3,340</b>	<b>1,205,739</b>	<b>1,203,470</b>	<b>1,192,826</b>	<b>5,566</b>	<b>18,479</b>
<b>Net change, excluding National Military Establishment.....</b>				<b>6,375</b>					<b>12,913</b>	
<b>National Military Establishment:</b>										
Office of the Secretary of Defense <sup>7</sup> .....	732	685	763	31		1,759	1,783	1,821	62	
Department of the Army:										
Inside continental United States.....	75,738	68,926	91,596	15,858		281,494	326,980	354,086	72,592	
Outside continental United States.....	11,022	9,141	10,301		721	39,470	40,602	41,763	2,293	
Department of the Air Force:										
Inside continental United States.....	38,995	37,956	46,028	7,033		133,513	144,110	149,030	15,517	
Outside continental United States.....	4,649	4,385	4,872	223		23,224	24,018	24,392	1,168	
Department of the Navy:										
Inside continental United States.....	78,206	79,451	92,953	14,747		277,665	298,633	309,274	31,609	
Outside continental United States.....	5,515	5,505	6,486	971		22,275	23,304	23,629	1,354	
<b>Total, National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>214,857</b>	<b>206,049</b>	<b>252,999</b>	<b>38,863</b>	<b>721</b>	<b>779,400</b>	<b>859,430</b>	<b>903,995</b>	<b>124,595</b>	
<b>Net increase, National Military Establishment.....</b>				<b>38,142</b>					<b>124,595</b>	
<b>Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>562,653</b>	<b>540,227</b>	<b>607,170</b>	<b>48,578</b>	<b>4,061</b>	<b>1,985,139</b>	<b>2,062,900</b>	<b>2,096,821</b>	<b>130,161</b>	<b>18,479</b>
<b>Net increase, including National Military Establishment.....</b>				<b>44,517</b>					<b>111,682</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Includes temporary employees (enumerators, supervisors, and clerks) engaged in taking the seventeenth decennial census as follows: July, 8,403; August, 2,169; September, 1,199; a decrease of 7,204.

<sup>2</sup> Exclusive of seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay as follows: July, 630; August, 285; and September, 390.

<sup>3</sup> Revised on basis of later information.

<sup>4</sup> Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

<sup>5</sup> Includes personnel and pay for Howard University and Columbia Institute for the Deaf.

<sup>6</sup> 921 employees of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation transferred Sept. 7, 1950, to the Housing and Home Finance Agency in accordance with Reorganization Plans Nos. 22 and 23.

<sup>7</sup> Includes 18 employees for July, 16 employees for August, and 15 employees for September assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and 170 employees for July, 178 employees for August, and 179 employees for September assigned to Munitions Board Cataloging Agency.

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during the period July through September 1950

Department or agency	July	August	September	Comparison of July and September		Department or agency	July	August	September	Comparison of July and September	
				Increase	Decrease					Increase	Decrease
<b>Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):</b>						<b>Independent agencies—Continued</b>					
Agriculture.....	82,709	82,275	76,032	-----	6,677	Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	13,599	13,502	14,261	662	-----
Commerce <sup>1,2</sup> .....	52,091	53,405	52,395	-----	304	Indian Claims Commission.....	10	10	10	-----	-----
Interior.....	57,889	57,145	54,572	-----	3,317	Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,087	2,075	2,052	-----	35
Justice.....	26,238	26,199	26,133	-----	105	National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	7,446	7,456	7,340	-----	106
Labor.....	5,928	5,965	6,048	-----	120	National Capital Housing Authority.....	316	316	318	-----	2
Post Office.....	494,028	491,906	490,698	-----	3,330	National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	21	19	18	-----	3
State.....	8,737	8,830	8,892	-----	155	National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission.....	233	235	203	-----	30
Treasury.....	86,812	86,057	85,970	-----	842	National Gallery of Art.....	331	322	302	-----	29
<b>Executive Office of the President:</b>						National Labor Relations Board.....	1,348	1,341	1,380	32	-----
White House Office.....	327	341	345	-----	18	National Mediation Board.....	128	129	124	-----	4
Bureau of the Budget.....	521	518	513	-----	8	Panama Canal.....	627	624	623	-----	4
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	68	64	64	-----	4	Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,297	2,240	2,200	-----	97
National Security Council <sup>3</sup> .....	17	16	16	-----	1	Reconstruction Finance Corporation <sup>4</sup> .....	4,587	4,572	3,593	-----	994
National Security Resources Board.....	369	384	431	-----	62	Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,005	1,002	1,000	-----	5
Council of Economic Advisers.....	35	37	36	-----	1	Selective Service System.....	4,894	5,998	6,354	1,460	-----
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion.....	5	5	5	-----	-----	Smithsonian Institution.....	548	539	532	-----	16
<b>Postwar agencies:</b>						Soldiers' Home.....	-----	4,734	735	735	-----
Displaced Persons Commission.....	87	93	93	-----	6	Tariff Commission.....	218	217	214	-----	4
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	1,176	1,189	1,183	-----	7	Tax Court of the United States.....	121	122	121	-----	-----
Motor Carrier Claims Commission.....	20	18	18	-----	2	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	14,006	14,152	14,387	381	-----
Office of the Housing Expediter.....	2,556	2,486	2,477	-----	79	Veterans' Administration.....	185,970	184,665	184,164	-----	1,806
Philippine Alien Property Administration.....	2	2	2	-----	-----	<b>Total, excluding National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>1,146,379</b>	<b>1,144,248</b>	<b>1,133,479</b>	<b>4,743</b>	<b>17,643</b>
Philippine War Damage Commission.....	6	6	9	-----	3	<b>Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>12,900</b>	<b>-----</b>
War Claims Commission.....	99	92	91	-----	8	<b>National Military Establishment:</b>					
<b>Independent agencies:</b>						Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	1,757	1,781	1,818	61	-----
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	17	16	15	-----	2	Department of the Army.....	281,494	326,980	354,086	72,592	-----
Atomic Energy Commission.....	5,048	5,047	5,030	-----	18	Department of the Air Force.....	133,513	144,110	149,030	15,517	-----
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	605	602	580	-----	25	Department of the Navy.....	277,665	298,633	309,274	31,609	-----
Civil Service Commission.....	3,400	3,416	3,438	-----	38	<b>Total National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>694,429</b>	<b>771,504</b>	<b>814,208</b>	<b>119,779</b>	<b>-----</b>
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	128	125	125	-----	3	<b>Net increase, National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>119,779</b>	<b>-----</b>
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,250	1,224	1,210	-----	40	<b>Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>1,840,808</b>	<b>1,915,752</b>	<b>1,947,687</b>	<b>124,522</b>	<b>17,643</b>
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,067	1,078	1,077	-----	10	<b>Net increase, including National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>106,879</b>	<b>-----</b>
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	327	326	324	-----	3						
Federal Power Commission.....	738	722	717	-----	21						
Federal Security Agency <sup>5</sup> .....	32,690	32,765	33,391	-----	701						
Federal Trade Commission.....	646	632	626	-----	20						
General Accounting Office.....	7,805	7,791	7,800	-----	5						
General Services Administration.....	26,031	26,085	26,077	-----	46						
Government Printing Office.....	7,115	7,116	7,115	-----	-----						

<sup>1</sup> Includes temporary employees (enumerators, supervisors, and clerks) engaged in taking the seventeenth decennial census, as follows: July, 8,232; August, 2,117; September, 1,168; a decrease of 7,064.  
<sup>2</sup> Exclusive of seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration, as follows: July, 630; August, 285; September, 390.  
<sup>3</sup> Exclusive of personnel of Central Intelligence Agency.

<sup>4</sup> Revised on basis of later information.  
<sup>5</sup> Includes personnel for Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.  
<sup>6</sup> 921 employees of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation transferred Sept. 7, 1950, to the Housing and Home Finance Agency in accordance with Reorganization Plans Nos. 22 and 23.

TABLE III.—Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period July through September 1950

Department or agency	July	August	September	Comparison of July and September		Department or agency	July	August	September	Comparison of July and September	
				Increase	Decrease					Increase	Decrease
<b>Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):</b>						<b>Independent agencies:</b>					
Agriculture.....	2,755	2,648	2,575	-----	180	American Battle Monuments Commission.....	480	488	540	60	-----
Commerce <sup>1</sup> .....	4,078	4,042	3,935	-----	143	Atomic Energy Commission.....	4	5	5	1	-----
Interior.....	7,662	7,588	7,055	-----	607	Civil Aeronautics Board.....	15	14	13	-----	2
Justice.....	479	484	480	-----	1	Civil Service Commission.....	4	4	4	-----	-----
Labor.....	105	105	103	-----	2	Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	1	1	1	-----	-----
Post Office.....	1,860	1,859	1,862	-----	2	Federal Communications Commission.....	26	26	24	-----	2
State.....	15,589	15,484	15,828	-----	239	Federal Security Agency.....	280	283	285	-----	5
Treasury.....	774	770	764	-----	10	General Services Administration.....	64	65	65	-----	1
<b>Postwar agencies:</b>						Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	74	78	83	9	-----
Displaced Persons Commission.....	175	190	196	-----	21	National Labor Relations Board.....	14	15	15	-----	1
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	3,487	3,495	3,542	-----	55	Panama Canal.....	19,196	19,353	19,754	558	-----
Office of the Housing Expediter.....	23	24	24	-----	1	Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	13	12	10	-----	3
Philippine Alien Property Administration.....	55	53	54	-----	1	Selective Service System.....	143	168	170	-----	27
Philippine War Damage Commission.....	500	477	455	-----	45						
War Claims Commission.....	-----	-----	9	-----	9						

<sup>1</sup> Includes temporary employees (enumerators, supervisors, and clerks) engaged in taking the seventeenth decennial census, as follows: July, 171; August, 52; September, 21.

TABLE III.—Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period July through September 1950—Continued

Department or agency	July	August	September	Comparison of July and September		Department or agency	July	August	September	Comparison of July and September	
				Increase	Decrease					Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued						National Military Establishment—Continued					
Smithsonian Institution.....	6	6	6			Department of the Air Force.....	23,224	24,018	24,392	1,168	
Veterans' Administration.....	1,498	1,485	1,490			Department of the Navy.....	22,275	23,304	23,629	1,354	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment.....	59,360	59,222	59,347	990	1,003	Total, National Military Establishment.....	84,971	87,926	89,787		
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment.....					13	Net increase, National Military Establishment.....					4,816
National Military Establishment:						Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....	144,331	147,148	149,134	5,806	1,003
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	2	2	3	1		Net increase, including National Military Establishment.....					4,803
Department of the Army.....	39,470	40,602	41,763	2,293							

<sup>2</sup> Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE IV.—Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period July through September 1950

Department or agency	July	August	September	Comparison of July and September		Department or agency	July	August	September	Comparison of July and September	
				Increase	Decrease					Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):						National Military Establishment—Continued					
Commerce.....	1,381	1,549	1,570	189		Department of the Air Force:					
Interior.....	7,048	6,849	6,373		675	Inside continental United States.....	75,440	82,158	85,175	9,735	
State.....	527	552	556	29		Outside continental United States.....	17,171	17,966	18,001	830	
Treasury.....	8,170	8,133	8,147		23	Department of the Navy:					
Independent agencies:						Inside continental United States.....	182,684	199,199	207,680	24,996	
Atomic Energy Commission.....	142	136	113		29	Outside continental United States.....	16,390	17,286	17,475	1,085	
General Services Administration.....	68	77	89	21		Total, National Military Establishment.....	460,072	514,826	543,119	83,047	
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	20	20	20			Net increase, National Military Establishment.....					83,047
Panama Canal.....	1,551	1,544	1,536		15	Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....	486,550	541,421	569,469	83,669	750
Smithsonian Institution.....	16	16	8		8	Net increase, including National Military Establishment.....					82,919
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	7,555	7,719	7,938	383							
Total, excluding National Military Establishment.....	26,478	26,595	26,350	622	750						
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment.....					128						
National Military Establishment:											
Department of the Army:											
Inside continental United States.....	146,275	175,838	192,067	45,792							
Outside continental United States.....	22,112	22,379	22,721	609							

TABLE V.—Federal employees assigned to mutual defense assistance program during the period July through September 1950 with comparison of July and September 1950

Department or agency	Civilian personnel				Payroll (in thousands)			
	July	August	September	Increase (+) or decrease (-)	June	July	August	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Total.....	20,474	23,912	26,654	+6,180	\$5,301	\$5,589	\$7,510	+\$2,209
State Department.....	192	197	220	+28	76	110	84	+8
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	5	11	12	+7	2	2	5	+3
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	37	38	38	+1	20	16	20	
Department of the Army.....	16,566	19,914	22,828	+6,262	3,033	4,457	6,243	+3,210
Department of the Air Force.....	908	743	886	-22	1,412	234	263	-1,149
Department of the Navy.....	2,766	3,009	2,670	-96	758	770	895	+137

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government continued moving upward in October for the fourth consecutive month. The net increase during the month was 33,563, averaging more than 1,000 a day. The October total was 2,130,384, as compared with 2,096,821 in September.

There was an increase in the civilian employment by the National Military Establish-

ment of 37,207. This was offset to some degree by a decrease of 3,644 in the civilian agencies.

Of the 37,207 increase in the Military Establishment, 22,364 were employed for industrial-type work, and 1,991 of these were assigned to duty stations outside continental United States. Total civilian employment for the National Military Establishment in October was 941,202 as compared with 903,995 in September.

In addition to the civilian increase in the Military Establishment, the Veterans' Administration also reported a substantial increase of 1,485.

Among the agencies reporting decreases were Agriculture with reductions totaling 3,243, Interior Department with reductions of 1,221, Post Office Department with reductions of 1,673, and the Commerce Department with reductions of 600. The reductions in Agriculture and Commerce Departments were

attributed largely to a decline in seasonal requirements, and the reductions in the Commerce Department were attributed to further separations among temporary employees for the Seventeenth Decennial Census.

Employment by the civilian agencies exclusive of the National Military Establishment in October totaled 1,189,182, as compared with 1,192,826 in September.

During September, the last month in the first quarter of fiscal year 1951, the civilian payroll was running at the rate of \$7,000,000,000 a year as compared with the original estimate in January of \$6,700,000,000.

These figures were developed today from official signed personnel reports submitted by the executive departments and agencies to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-

essential Federal Expenditures for the month of October.

**FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER 1950, AND PAY, AUGUST-SEPTEMBER 1950**

Note with reference to personal service expenditure figures: It should be noted that the latest expenditure figures for personal service shown in table I of this report are for the month of September, and that they are compared with personal service expenditure figures for the month of August, whereas the latest employment figures covered in this report are for the month of October and are compared with the month of September. This lag in personal service expenditure figures is necessary in order that actual expenditures may be reported.

(Figures in the following report are com-

pared from signed official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, and pay, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed inside continental United States. Table III shows personnel employed outside continental United States. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

**PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY**  
(See table I)

According to monthly personnel reports for October 1950 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

Department or agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In October numbered—	In September numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)	In September was—	In August was—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Total.....	2,130,384	2,096,821	+33,563	\$590,714	\$607,170	-\$16,456
1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment.....	1,189,182	1,192,826	-3,644	336,040	354,171	-18,131
2. National Military Establishment.....	941,202	903,995	+37,207	254,674	252,999	+1,675
Within the National Military Establishment:						
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	1,947	1,821	+126	738	763	-25
Department of the Army.....	413,428	395,849	+17,579	104,753	101,897	+2,856
Department of the Air Force.....	179,127	173,422	+5,705	48,480	50,900	-2,420
Department of the Navy.....	346,700	332,903	+13,797	100,703	99,439	+1,264

**MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM**  
Table V shows personnel counted in tables I, II, III, and IV who are assigned to

the mutual defense assistance program by the Commerce and State Departments, Economic Cooperation Administration, and the

component units of the National Military Establishment, together with their pay.

**TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during October 1950, and comparison with November 1950; and pay for September 1950, and comparison with August 1950**

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	August	September	Increase	Decrease	September	October	Increase	Decrease
<b>Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):</b>								
Agriculture.....	\$24,799	\$22,188	-----	\$2,611	78,607	75,364	-----	3,243
Commerce <sup>1,2,3</sup> .....	18,389	17,491	-----	898	56,330	55,730	-----	600
Interior.....	20,091	18,324	-----	1,767	61,627	60,406	-----	1,221
Justice.....	10,049	9,563	-----	486	26,613	26,965	-----	352
Labor.....	2,035	2,063	\$28	-----	6,151	6,324	-----	173
Post Office.....	130,360	128,764	-----	1,596	492,560	490,887	-----	1,673
State.....	7,592	7,517	-----	75	24,720	24,826	-----	106
Treasury.....	31,317	27,196	-----	4,121	86,734	86,278	-----	456
<b>Executive Office of the President:</b>								
White House Office.....	162	147	-----	15	345	345	-----	-----
Bureau of the Budget.....	273	247	-----	26	513	502	-----	11
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	20	16	-----	4	64	68	-----	4
National Security Council <sup>4</sup> .....	11	8	-----	3	16	18	-----	2
National Security Resources Board.....	222	191	-----	31	431	450	-----	19
Council of Economic Advisers.....	23	21	-----	2	36	36	-----	-----
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion.....	2	2	-----	-----	5	5	-----	-----
<b>Postwar agencies:</b>								
Displaced Persons Commission.....	104	105	1	-----	289	290	-----	1
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	1,641	1,662	21	-----	4,725	4,784	-----	59
Economic Stabilization Agency <sup>6</sup> .....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	29	-----	29
Motor Carrier Claims Commission.....	11	10	-----	1	18	16	-----	2
Office of the Housing Expediter.....	956	903	-----	53	2,514	2,514	-----	-----
Philippine Alien Property Administration.....	9	9	-----	-----	56	58	-----	2
Philippine War Damage Commission.....	147	112	-----	35	464	424	-----	40
War Claims Commission.....	25	35	10	-----	100	104	-----	4
<b>Independent agencies:</b>								
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	60	63	3	-----	555	604	-----	49
Atomic Energy Commission.....	2,103	1,830	-----	273	5,035	5,024	-----	11
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	290	252	-----	38	593	567	-----	26
Civil Service Commission.....	1,203	1,105	-----	98	3,442	3,588	-----	146
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	66	61	-----	5	126	129	-----	3
Federal Communications Commission.....	503	503	-----	-----	1,234	1,235	-----	1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	421	393	-----	28	1,077	1,084	-----	7
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	194	181	-----	13	324	326	-----	2
Federal Power Commission.....	323	293	-----	30	717	720	-----	3
Federal Security Agency <sup>7</sup> .....	10,206	9,222	-----	984	33,676	34,325	-----	649
Federal Trade Commission.....	315	275	-----	40	626	620	-----	6
General Accounting Office.....	2,800	2,547	-----	253	7,500	7,570	-----	70
General Services Administration.....	7,266	7,091	-----	175	26,142	26,286	-----	144
Government Printing Office.....	2,795	2,568	-----	227	7,115	7,147	-----	32
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	4,887	5,049	162	-----	14,344	14,247	-----	97
Indian Claims Commission.....	7	7	-----	-----	10	10	-----	-----
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	877	796	-----	81	2,052	2,046	-----	6

<sup>1</sup> Includes temporary employees (enumerators, supervisors, and clerks) engaged in taking the Seventeenth Decennial Census as follows: September, 1,199; October, 514; a decrease of 685.

<sup>2</sup> October figure is exclusive of 765 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

<sup>3</sup> Includes 515 employees for the National Production Authority, an increase of 132 over the September total of 383.

<sup>4</sup> Includes 13 employees transferred to Department of Labor from the Federal Security Agency under sec. 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 19 of 1950.

<sup>5</sup> Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

<sup>6</sup> New agency established under pt. 4, Executive Order No. 10,161, dated Sept. 9, 1950, activated Oct. 16, 1950.

<sup>7</sup> Includes personnel and pay for Howard University and Columbia Institute for the Deaf.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during October 1950, and comparison with November 1950; and pay for September 1950; and comparison with August 1950—Con.

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	August	September	Increase	Decrease	September	October	Increase	Decrease
<b>Independent agencies—Continued</b>								
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	\$2,593	\$2,370	-----	\$223	7,340	7,321	-----	19
National Capital Housing Authority.....	89	82	-----	7	318	320	-----	2
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	7	7	-----	-----	18	18	-----	-----
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission.....	55	51	-----	4	203	33	-----	170
National Gallery of Art.....	89	80	-----	9	302	305	-----	3
National Labor Relations Board.....	549	518	-----	31	1,395	1,429	-----	34
National Mediation Board.....	63	76	-----	\$13	124	120	-----	4
Panama Canal.....	3,008	3,894	-----	886	20,377	20,259	-----	118
Railroad Retirement Board.....	725	663	-----	62	2,200	2,158	-----	42
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	1,942	1,489	-----	453	3,603	3,587	-----	16
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	463	427	-----	36	1,000	1,081	-----	31
Selective Service System.....	1,324	1,194	-----	130	6,524	6,994	-----	470
Smithsonian Institution.....	200	178	-----	22	538	543	-----	5
Soldiers' Home.....	165	110	-----	55	735	735	-----	-----
Tariff Commission.....	103	95	-----	8	214	210	-----	4
Tax Court of the United States.....	53	58	-----	5	121	129	-----	8
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	4,542	4,174	-----	368	14,387	14,600	-----	213
Veterans' Administration.....	55,647	51,764	-----	3,883	185,634	187,139	-----	1,485
<b>Total, excluding National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>354,171</b>	<b>336,040</b>	<b>1,129</b>	<b>19,260</b>	<b>1,192,826</b>	<b>1,189,182</b>	<b>4,121</b>	<b>7,765</b>
<b>Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment.....</b>			<b>18,131</b>				<b>3,644</b>	
<b>National Military Establishment:</b>								
Office of the Secretary of Defense *.....	763	738	-----	25	1,821	1,947	-----	126
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States.....	91,596	94,539	-----	2,943	354,086	370,689	-----	16,603
Outside continental United States.....	10,301	10,214	-----	87	41,763	42,739	-----	976
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States.....	46,028	43,726	-----	2,302	149,030	154,207	-----	5,177
Outside continental United States.....	4,872	4,754	-----	118	24,392	24,920	-----	528
Department of the Navy:								
Inside continental United States.....	92,953	94,533	-----	1,580	309,274	321,566	-----	12,292
Outside continental United States.....	6,486	6,170	-----	316	23,629	25,134	-----	1,505
<b>Total, National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>252,999</b>	<b>254,674</b>	<b>4,523</b>	<b>2,848</b>	<b>903,995</b>	<b>941,202</b>	<b>37,207</b>	<b>37,207</b>
<b>Net increase, National Military Establishment.....</b>			<b>1,675</b>				<b>37,207</b>	
<b>Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>607,170</b>	<b>590,714</b>	<b>5,652</b>	<b>22,108</b>	<b>2,096,821</b>	<b>2,130,384</b>	<b>41,328</b>	<b>7,765</b>
<b>Net change, including National Military Establishment.....</b>			<b>16,456</b>				<b>33,563</b>	

\* Includes 18 employees assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and 200 employees assigned to Munitions Board Cataloging Agency.

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during October 1950 and comparison with September 1950

Department or agency	September	October	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	September	October	Increase	Decrease
<b>Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):</b>					<b>Independent agencies—Continued</b>				
Agriculture.....	76,032	72,922	-----	3,110	Indian Claims Commission.....	10	10	-----	-----
Commerce <sup>1 2</sup> .....	52,395	51,973	-----	422	Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,052	2,046	-----	6
Interior.....	54,572	55,504	-----	908	National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	7,340	7,321	-----	19
Justice.....	26,133	26,484	-----	351	National Capital Housing Authority.....	318	320	-----	2
Labor.....	6,048	4,621	-----	167	National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	18	18	-----	-----
Post Office.....	490,698	489,042	-----	1,656	National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission.....	203	33	-----	170
State.....	8,892	9,012	-----	120	National Gallery of Art.....	302	305	-----	3
Treasury.....	85,970	85,519	-----	451	National Labor Relations Board.....	1,380	1,415	-----	35
<b>Executive Office of the President:</b>					National Mediation Board.....				
White House Office.....	345	345	-----	-----	Panama Canal.....	623	625	-----	2
Bureau of the Budget.....	513	502	-----	11	Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,200	2,158	-----	42
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	64	68	-----	4	Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	3,593	3,577	-----	16
National Security Council.....	16	18	-----	2	Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,000	1,031	-----	31
National Security Resources Board.....	431	450	-----	19	Selective Service System.....	6,354	6,767	-----	413
Council of Economic Advisers.....	36	36	-----	-----	Smithsonian Institution.....	532	535	-----	3
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion.....	5	5	-----	-----	Soldiers' Home.....	735	735	-----	-----
<b>Postwar agencies:</b>					Tariff Commission.....				
Displaced Persons Commission.....	93	97	-----	4	Tax Court of the United States.....	121	129	-----	8
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	1,183	1,189	-----	6	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	14,387	14,600	-----	213
Economic Stabilization Agency.....	-----	29	-----	29	Veterans' Administration.....	184,164	185,634	-----	1,470
Motor Carrier Claims Commission.....	18	16	-----	2	<b>Total, excluding National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>1,133,479</b>	<b>1,130,397</b>	<b>3,954</b>	<b>7,036</b>
Office of the Housing Expediter.....	2,477	2,489	-----	12	<b>Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment.....</b>			<b>3,082</b>	
Philippine Alien Property Administration.....	2	2	-----	-----	<b>National Military Establishment:</b>				
Philippine War Damage Commission.....	9	6	-----	3	Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	1,818	1,944	-----	126
War Claims Commission.....	91	95	-----	4	Department of the Army.....	354,086	370,689	-----	16,603
<b>Independent agencies:</b>					Department of the Air Force.....				
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	15	15	-----	-----	Department of the Navy.....	309,274	321,566	-----	12,292
Atomic Energy Commission.....	5,030	5,019	-----	11	<b>Total, National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>814,208</b>	<b>848,406</b>	<b>34,198</b>	<b>34,198</b>
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	580	553	-----	27	<b>Net increase, National Military Establishment.....</b>			<b>34,198</b>	
Civil Service Commission.....	3,438	3,584	-----	146	<b>Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>1,947,687</b>	<b>1,978,803</b>	<b>38,152</b>	<b>7,036</b>
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	125	128	-----	3	<b>Net increase, including National Military Establishment.....</b>			<b>31,116</b>	
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,210	1,211	-----	1					
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,077	1,084	-----	7					
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	324	326	-----	2					
Federal Power Commission.....	717	720	-----	3					
Federal Security Agency.....	33,391	34,036	-----	645					
Federal Trade Commission.....	626	620	-----	6					
General Accounting Office.....	7,800	7,870	-----	70					
General Services Administration.....	26,077	26,224	-----	147					
Government Printing Office.....	7,115	7,147	-----	32					
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	14,261	14,153	-----	108					

<sup>1</sup> Includes temporary employees (enumerators, supervisors, and clerks) engaged in taking the Seventeenth Decennial Census as follows: September, 1,168; October, 514; decrease of 654.  
<sup>2</sup> Exclusive of 765 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration in October.  
<sup>3</sup> Includes 515 employees for the National Production Authority, an increase of 132 over the September total of 383.  
<sup>4</sup> Includes 13 employees transferred to Department of Labor from the Federal Security Agency under sec. 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 19 of 1950.  
<sup>5</sup> Exclusive of personnel of Central Intelligence Agency.  
<sup>6</sup> New agency established under pt. 4, Executive Order No. 10,161, dated Sept. 9, 1950, activated Oct. 16, 1950.  
<sup>7</sup> Includes personnel for Howard University and Columbia Institute for the Deaf.

TABLE III.—Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during October 1950 and comparison with September 1950

Department or agency	September	October	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	September	October	Increase	Decrease
<b>Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):</b>					<b>Independent agencies—Continued</b>				
Agriculture.....	2,575	2,442	-----	133	National Labor Relations Board.....	15	14	-----	1
Commerce.....	3,935	3,757	-----	178	Panama Canal.....	19,754	19,634	-----	120
Interior.....	7,055	6,802	-----	253	Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	10	10	-----	-----
Justice.....	480	481	-----	1	Selective Service System.....	170	227	-----	57
Labor.....	103	109	-----	6	Smithsonian Institution.....	6	8	-----	2
Post Office.....	1,862	1,845	-----	17	Veterans' Administration.....	1,490	1,505	-----	15
State.....	15,828	15,814	-----	14	<b>Total, excluding National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>59,347</b>	<b>58,785</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>202</b>
Treasury.....	764	759	-----	5	<b>Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>562</b>
<b>Postwar agencies:</b>					<b>National Military Establishment:</b>				
Displaced Persons Commission.....	196	193	-----	3	Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	3	3	-----	-----
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	3,542	3,595	-----	53	Department of the Army.....	41,763	42,739	-----	976
Office of the Housing Expediter.....	24	25	-----	1	Department of the Air Force.....	24,392	24,920	-----	528
Philippine Alien Property Administration.....	54	56	-----	2	Department of the Navy.....	23,629	25,134	-----	1,505
Philippine War Damage Commission.....	455	418	-----	37	<b>Total, National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>89,787</b>	<b>92,796</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>3,009</b>
War Claims Commission.....	9	9	-----	-----	<b>Net increase, National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>3,009</b>
<b>Independent agencies:</b>					<b>Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>149,134</b>	<b>151,581</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>764</b>
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	540	589	-----	49	<b>Net increase, including National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>2,447</b>
Atomic Energy Commission.....	5	5	-----	-----					
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	13	14	-----	1					
Civil Service Commission.....	4	4	-----	-----					
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	1	1	-----	-----					
Federal Communications Commission.....	24	24	-----	-----					
Federal Security Agency.....	285	289	-----	4					
General Services Administration.....	65	62	-----	3					
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	83	94	-----	11					

TABLE IV.—Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during October 1950 and comparison with September 1950

Department or agency	September	October	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	September	October	Increase	Decrease
<b>Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):</b>					<b>National Military Establishment:</b>				
Commerce.....	1,570	1,327	-----	243	Department of the Army:				
Interior.....	6,373	5,572	-----	801	Inside continental United States.....	192,067	201,563	-----	9,496
State.....	656	558	-----	98	Outside continental United States.....	22,721	23,065	-----	344
Treasury.....	8,147	8,275	-----	128	Department of the Air Force:				
<b>Independent agencies:</b>					Inside continental United States.....	85,175	87,752	-----	2,577
Atomic Energy Commission.....	113	116	-----	3	Outside continental United States.....	18,001	18,405	-----	404
General Services Administration.....	89	97	-----	8	Department of the Navy:				
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	20	20	-----	-----	Inside continental United States.....	207,680	215,980	-----	8,300
Panama Canal.....	1,536	1,514	-----	22	Outside continental United States.....	17,475	18,718	-----	1,243
Smithsonian Institution.....	8	8	-----	-----	<b>Total, National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>543,119</b>	<b>565,483</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>22,364</b>
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	7,938	8,115	-----	177	<b>Net increase, National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>22,364</b>
<b>Total, excluding National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>26,350</b>	<b>25,602</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>748</b>	<b>Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>569,469</b>	<b>591,085</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>1,066</b>
<b>Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>Net increase, including National Military Establishment.....</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>21,616</b>

TABLE V.—Federal employees assigned to mutual defense assistance program

Department or agency	Civilian personnel			Payroll (in thousands)		
	In October numbered—	In September numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)	In September was—	In August was—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>27,128</b>	<b>26,654</b>	<b>+474</b>	<b>\$7,686</b>	<b>\$7,510</b>	<b>+\$176</b>
Commerce Department.....	1	-----	+1	1	-----	+1
State Department.....	221	220	+1	82	84	-2
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	16	12	+4	9	5	+4
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	39	35	+4	16	20	-4
Department of the Army.....	23,384	22,828	+556	6,428	6,243	+185
Department of the Air Force.....	910	886	+24	317	263	+54
Department of the Navy.....	2,557	2,670	-113	833	895	-62

**BILLS INTRODUCED**

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 4223. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 4224. A bill for the relief of Jose Maria Sangroniz-Equilluz; and

S. 4225. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Aguirrechu y Zuazo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 4226. A bill for the relief of certain Yugoslavs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 4227. A bill to authorize payments on automobiles purchased by certain amputee veterans of the Korean operations equal to those authorized for veterans of World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 4228. A bill for the relief of Col. Arthur L. Shreve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL—AMENDMENTS**

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I submit amendments intended to be proposed by me to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and

Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be printed in the RECORD and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. FLANDERS to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, viz: At the end of the joint resolution insert the following new section:

"Sec. 2. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 204 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947,

as amended, is amended by striking out 'paragraphs (2) and (3)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'paragraphs (2), (3), and (6).'

"(b) Section 204 (b) of such act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Housing Expediter shall promptly make a general adjustment in the maximum rents for all controlled housing accommodations so as to provide for fixing such maximum rents at the rate prevailing for comparable housing accommodations not under control, and he shall from time to time make adjustments for such relevant factors as he shall determine and deem to be of general applicability in respect of such accommodations, including increases or decreases in property taxes and other costs within the defense rental area."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and to provide a more appropriate base for rental rates under such act."

**PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950**

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 370), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That there be printed 1,000 additional copies of the hearings conducted before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on S. 3936, Eighty-first Congress, on the Defense Production Act of 1950. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

**HOUSE BILL REFERRED**

The bill (H. R. 9827) to provide revenue by imposing a corporate excess-profits tax, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

**THE FUTURE OF COFFEE IN THE AMERICAN ECONOMIC PICTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER**

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on December 5, 1950, at Boca Raton, Fla., before the National Coffee Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

**SOUND RECLAMATION DEVELOPMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CORDON**

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Sound Reclamation Development," delivered by Senator CORDON before the National Reclamation Association at Spokane, Wash., on November 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

**RECLAMATION BUREAU POLICY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER**

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by him covering Reclamation Bureau policy, which appears in the Appendix.]

**A FORMULA FOR ACTION IN TODAY'S CRISIS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT**

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on a formula for action in today's crisis, and a condensation of an editorial published by the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman, which appear in the Appendix.]

**WATER SUPPLY ASSURED FOR RENSSELAER COUNTY—ARTICLE BY BILL BREISKY**

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Water Supply Assured for Rensselaer County," written by Bill Breisky, and published in the October 5, 1950, issue of the Times-Union, of Albany, N. Y., which appears in the Appendix.]

**FLAG OF THE FREE—POEM BY JOHN A. HOFSTEAD**

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Flag of the Free," written by John A. Hofstead, which appears in the Appendix.]

**COUNSEL FOR THE MINORITY—REPORT ON THE TYDINGS INVESTIGATION BY ROBERT MORRIS**

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Counsel for the Minority—A Report on the Tydings Investigation," written by Robert Morris, and published in the October 20, 1950, issue of the Freeman, which appears in the Appendix.]

**MACARTHUR'S DISASTER**

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "MacArthur's Disaster," published in the New York Herald Tribune of December 6, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

**THE WAR IN KOREA**

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the war in Korea, written by Homer Bigart, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of December 6, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

**NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM F. RILEY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA**

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, December 13, 1950, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of William F. Riley, of Iowa, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Iowa, vice Hon. Charles A. Dewey, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

**NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ALFRED E. MODARELLI TO BE A UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, December 13, 1950, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Alfred E. Modarelli, of New Jersey, to be a United States district judge for the dis-

trict of New Jersey to fill a new position. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

**NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. CHUCK MAU TO BE SECOND JUDGE, FIRST CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII**

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, December 13, 1950, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Chuck Mau, of Hawaii, to be second judge, first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Edward A. Towse, elevated. Judge Mau is now serving in a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

**NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. PAUL D. SHRIVER TO BE UNITED STATES JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM**

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, December 13, 1950, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Paul D. Shriver, of Colorado, to be United States judge for the district court of Guam. Judge Shriver is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

**NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. WALTER M. BASTIAN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, December 13, 1950, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Walter M. Bastian, of the District of Columbia, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia. Judge Bastian is now serving in a recess appointment. At the indicated time and

place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

#### THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, several thousand citizens are meeting this week in Washington in the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth. They are people from every State in the Union, from farms, small towns, and cities. They are people of all faiths and nationalities, people representing hundreds of national civic and professional organizations. Some represent local and State White House committees and conferences which have been looking into what their communities and States are doing for children and what more needs to be done.

This is a conference of people—including young people as well as adults—who are pooling their experience, the facts they have found, their ideas and their hopes of what can be done in the years ahead to help children develop their own capacities to the utmost to handle the responsibilities and problems that are before them.

Because it is a representative group, the findings of this conference will influence in great measure, and for years to come, all manner of programs and activities that are undertaken in behalf of children.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD in connection with this statement three newspaper columns written by myself and distributed by United Feature Syndicate.

There being no objection, the columns were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### WASHINGTON AND YOU

(By United States Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

##### OUR CHILDREN—AMERICA'S FUTURE—I

WASHINGTON.—Beginning next Sunday, December 3, the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth will be in session here. The meetings will last 5 days and while I will be in Tucson, Ariz., for a lecture engagement on Sunday I hope to attend some of the sessions later in the week.

Considered at the conference will be (1) the technical report dealing with the facts established by the sciences that contribute to our knowledge of child growth and development; (2) information about programs and practices affecting children and young people in such fields as education, health, welfare, religion, recreation, play, and leisure-time activities; and (3) reports of the problems, accomplishments, and conditions relating to our children.

This meeting will not be just a debating-society event. Definite action will come from it. Findings and recommendations will be made by more than threescore agencies of the Federal Government, several hundred national voluntary organizations serving children and young people and thousands of private citizens.

The goal of the conference is simple and clear, but yet far-reaching. The aim is to give to every child a fair chance for a healthy personality. There is nothing new in this

objective, but there is in the approach toward achieving the goal.

While past efforts have been more on the individual scale in the private home and in local and State groups, the approach now will be on a coordinated, organized national basis.

The awful truth is that thousands of our children just don't get the care and affection in their homes that make for their growing into valuable adult citizens. Many more thousands are homeless. In the great majority of case histories of criminals there is always found a background of an unhappy home life. The care and affection that might have molded him into a valuable, law-abiding citizen was missing.

Vague generalities will not dominate the conference. Instead it will seek specifically at least partial answers to (1) how can children be helped to develop the mental, emotional, and spiritual qualities essential for individual happiness and responsible citizenship and (2) what physical, economic, and social conditions are necessary for this development.

The conference will be divided into five sections. Section I will deal with furthering healthy personality development in children and youth; section II with furthering healthy personality development through the family, the church, the school and other social institutions; section III with making more positive the influence of religious, social and economic forces on personality development; section IV with furthering the healthy personality development of children in special situations, such as children in families with inadequate incomes, with part-time parents, on the move, with severe physical and mental limitations, with severe emotional disorders, and who rebel; and section V with mobilizing citizens for the improvement of conditions affecting the personality development of children and youth.

I will continue this discussion tomorrow with observations as to the need for this conference and organized effort outside of the family home.

##### WASHINGTON AND YOU

(By United States Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

##### OUR CHILDREN—AMERICA'S FUTURE—II

WASHINGTON.—To most of you who are fond parents whose interest in life is centered in your children and in giving them the very best that you can, the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth may not seem necessary or of vital importance. Perhaps you may feel that children are a private family concern of parents and something for which the Government has no responsibility and should have no voice. Yet, it is to you conscientious parents that the conference to be held here next week should mean the most.

The fantastic discovery and development of physical sciences during the first half of the twentieth century certainly underscore the fact that in this atomic age none of us knows what the next 50 years will bring. But our children and their children and grandchildren will know.

Key to the future now is tied to the use that is made of physical energy, of atomic power and of the many other amazing discoveries of the past 50 years. What the use is will be in the hands of our children. Their decision will in turn depend upon the manner and degree to which we equip and prepare them to handle the power and the problems we will to them.

This should make it crystal clear to all of us that we must make it possible for our children to develop, to the utmost, their individual capacities for creative living. Their talents must be directed toward ways to give positive meaning and high purpose to life. Consequently, it is imperative

that we carefully appraise just how much our society is doing on this score, how much it isn't doing, and how much and what it should do to secure for every child a fair chance for a healthy personality.

The rapidly growing population of our country and the many mutual interests and concern that we share have accelerated our appreciation and use of cooperative planning and action. One form of such cooperative effort is the White House Conference, which has been held every 10 years since 1900. Gratifying achievements have been realized in meeting the physical and material needs of children. But this progress has not been matched on the spiritual, mental, and emotional needs of children because the past emphasis has not been so much on this side. It will be in the future, however, in the recognition that mental juvenile health is as important as physical juvenile health.

There is a great gap between what we do and what we know. That gap has made growing up a hazardous experience for many children today. If there be any doubt of this, one need only check the court records on dependent, neglected, and delinquent children; or on the hundreds of millions of dollars spent each year on hospitals for the mentally ill, on social workers, on experts studying divorce, desertion, and crime.

Less susceptible for measurement is the human erosion that stems from neglected children who grow up to be maladjusted adults—suspicious, frightened, angry people who spend their life in misery and make life unpleasant for relatives and friends. Nor is there any accounting for the inately talented humans whose gifts are never developed because of juvenile neglect. These persons might have contributed immeasurably toward scholarship, statesmanship, creative expression, and citizenship.

How the child is molded today greatly controls the shape of the adult tomorrow. Yet in the speed of the breathtaking events of the present—at the very time when impressionable adolescence can be irreparably warped by lack of balanced perception based on maturity of experience and judgment—there is a dangerous trend to assume that children are automatically smarter today because of the radio, the television, etc., than yesterday's children. It is against this danger and for the maximum application of mature guidance, that the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth is aimed.

Tomorrow I shall conclude this series by trying to point up some of the complicated aspects of this problem.

##### WASHINGTON AND YOU

(By United States Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

##### OUR CHILDREN—AMERICA'S FUTURE—III

WASHINGTON.—The primary objective of the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth next week is to provide every child with at least a fair chance to develop a healthy personality. "Personality" in this case doesn't mean just charm. It means the aggregate of the child now and as an adult later—what he is, has been, and aspires to be.

Heredity and environment are commonly accepted as the two determinants of what each of us is like. Each of us takes from his environment that which he needs for spiritual gratification, physical fulfillment, mental, emotional, and social realization. This is a part of the growing process—of the transition from childhood through adolescence to manhood.

And from that accumulated experience of the growing process it is inescapable that the quality of any individual personality is in direct ratio to the quality of the life experience. Therefore, if any of our children become deficient adults, it must be at-

tributable to the lack of providing conditions necessary for proper growth and realization of basic aspirations.

To blind ourselves to this and to our responsibility is to surrender to a continuing wastage of human resources. Unchecked, that can lead only to national moral, mental, and physical bankruptcy. Our greatest asset is human resources—and our greatest human resources are our children. How are they doing in our country? We must find out and we must act upon those findings.

Last year one-third of our total population was children and young people. Generally speaking, they were doing well physically and their physical health had been well cared for.

But the records of juvenile delinquency marred the mental health side of the picture. It has become increasingly clear that this is largely the result of lack of emotional security for our children.

In combating this problem in the past we have made the mistake of using hit-and-miss theories instead of a thorough analytical approach. We have tried to apply contradictory cures before diagnosing the ills, symptoms, and causes. We have put the cart before the horse.

If you need any proof that our cures are contradictory, let me list a few of broad and popular vintage. Some people say that newborn babies should be fed by the clock. Others maintain that babies should themselves set their own feeding times and let you know by crying when they are hungry. And when a baby cries, some people say let him cry it out. Others, in horror, say that the crying baby should be picked up and rocked back to sleep or contentment.

Some people say children should be mentally disciplined without the use of physical force. Others say, "Spare the rod and spoil the child." There are those who advocate that children be given freedom to use free hours as they will. Others say this only leads to children getting into trouble and that they still look to us for guidance.

There are conflicting "rule of thumb" theories on personality development. Some people express the belief that a child's personality is set by the time he is 5 or some other exact age and that it doesn't matter what is done by parents and adults after that time, while others contend that people change and grow at every age.

It's high time that we found out which theories are right and which are wrong. It's high time that we found facts instead of theorizing only on the basis of personal, unsubstantiated beliefs. If we, as adults, are not in agreement and are confused, what then is the case with the children themselves?

It is in this realization that next week's White House conference is striking out to determine the facts and find the answers as much as is humanly possible. All-inclusive, quick cures are not anticipated, because findings must come before cures. But it is this very spirit which augurs so well for the work of this group and which merits the full support of you and me.

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR COMBATING AND DEFEATING AGGRESSION

Mr. MAGNUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CAIN. I appreciate the indulgence of my colleague the senior Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, only in order to minimize questions, I ought to say that for about a year I have been in need of surgical attention to correct a wartime ailment. In an effort to prepare myself

physically for the Eighty-second Congress the necessary work will be undertaken on the date I am permitted to be absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. President, the United Nations are busy, the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain are busy, and most of us as Senators are busy at everybody's task of anticipating the needs and requirements of tomorrow.

Unfortunately, though the fact may be unavoidable at this time, we in the Senate of the United States and America generally, are not informed as to what the United Nations or the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain have in mind for tomorrow. It is likely that no firm decisions have been reached. All of us hope that a course of positive and understandable action will soon be agreed upon and presented in its every last detail to the American people.

In an effort to be helpful to those in higher executive and policy-making authority who must be as troubled and anxious these days as I am, I offer my own estimate of the situation which presently perplexes mankind.

If we, the United States, are to continue to work in and with the United Nations in its and our oft-repeated determination to stop and defeat aggression wherever and whenever it breaks out, every member nation, and this means fifty-odd nations, must immediately design a balance sheet which will accurately reflect the contribution in manpower, resources, and the armed forces it can or will make to the common effort and when these contributions can be drawn against; an effective mobile and hard-striking international police force must be promptly developed as a weapon to enforce policies and decisions of the United Nations; an American supreme commander must be appointed for the Atlantic Pact countries without delay, and each member nation within that pact must determine and then state publicly the number of ground force divisions, air and naval strength it can or will contribute to the defense of the North Atlantic community; Turkey and Greece must become full and equal members of the Atlantic Pact; every possibility for having Sweden become a member of the Atlantic Pact must be explored; a military, political, and economic understanding ought promptly be worked out with Spain, and Spain ought to become a full and equal member of the Atlantic Pact; Germany must be made a free and self-governed nation and given its complete right to rearm as it thinks best; Japan must be reconstituted as a nation and given the right and opportunity to rearm.

Unless these impelling requirements, most of which have been outstanding for years, are met and satisfied soon, any global contest against the forces of aggression, which is what we appear to be headed toward, will be no contest at all, and the free world if considered as a whole, and freedom, too, will disappear from the face of the earth for decades.

If an agreement is not reached to take prompt and positive action on these requirements, the United States, in my considered opinion, can only survive as

a nation by living within its own confines and by using its own resources and strength to defend itself.

There can be no middle ground in the future. The United Nations and the free world must work, fight, and contribute jointly and equitably to either war or peace, or each nation must go its own way and do what it can to save itself.

The hour for decision is tragically late. The United Nations and the North Atlantic Community had better come to grips with the requirements in question and do so right now. Whether time remains to take the imperatively required steps must remain in serious doubt until the free world has agreed upon an operational plan and until this plan becomes effective.

America does not know at this moment where it really stands, or with whom it stands or from whom it can expect anything but words. America had better find out now where America stands—if America wants to live tomorrow.

How many of these stated considerations are under pointed and pressing consideration by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and by the United Nations, I do not know. How happy I should be as an American were I soon to be advised that action was being taken on all or most of them.

It is too easy to oversimplify a complicated and delicate situation. Perhaps I am guilty of doing this. My intention, however, has been to offer one man's evaluation of the day in which we live. As a Member of the Senate, I think it is for those who are closer to the questions to prove me wrong if my assumptions are not supported by fact. I have spoken as one American who wants to be of some constructive assistance to those in higher authority. I have spoken as one American who represents the views of other Americans. As Americans we want to know what those in higher authority expect of us. Until we are told by those in higher authority what is to be demanded from America and the free world I shall offer my own view for whatever it may be worth whenever I hold this action to be proper and constructive.

#### SHIPMENTS OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS FROM UNITED STATES PORTS TO COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, in the last few days, upon learning that shipments of strategic materials were en route from United States ports to Communist China, I felt it a duty to make demand that these cargoes be denied to the enemy now engaged in deadly combat with our troops.

Two days ago, after receiving a cablegram from members of the crew of a United States ship in Hong Kong, I called the attention of the United States Senate to the startling facts in that case. As a result the cargo was unloaded in Hong Kong and will not be delivered to the Communists, as intended.

Over the week end, having learned that another ship had cleared from New York and was bound for North China with a sizable shipment of steel sheets, a highly strategic material, I urged the Office of International Trade to take any steps necessary to prevent the shipment reaching the proposed destination. Today this cargo is being unloaded in San Francisco. Thus, in these instances, it has been possible to thwart the efforts of our Communist foes to secure this very important matériel.

However, this by no means includes all the shipments of items of possible military or industrial use which are now being transported to Communist China.

In recent weeks, eight ships carrying the United States flag have left the port of New York bound for North China or Hong Kong carrying such material. Today these ships are on the high seas and, unless preventive action is taken, the cargoes will undoubtedly be delivered into the hands of the Nation's enemies.

One ship left New York November 2 carrying 125 drums of petrolatum, 17,000 pounds of penicillin, and 7,000 pounds of strategic materials.

A second ship sailed from New York November 13 carrying 865,000 pounds of second-grade tinplate.

A third, which sailed from New York November 15 carrying 267,000 pounds of tin, over 28,000 pounds streptomycin, over 18,000 pounds sulphadiazine.

A fourth, which left New York November 16 carrying over 3,000,000 pounds second-grade tin and other tin-mill products.

A fifth, which sailed from New York November 24 carrying 549,000 pounds tinplate, and so forth.

A sixth, which sailed from New York November 24 carrying thousands of pounds of auto parts.

Another ship, which left New York November 27 carrying 650,000 pounds of second-grade tinplate and tinplate materials.

An eighth ship, which left New York November 27 carrying 26,000 pounds of second-grade tinplate.

The names and present locations of the ships are readily available to our Federal officials.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I shall be pleased to yield when I have concluded my statement. I hope the Senator will bear with me so the continuity of the statement may be preserved.

Mr. THYE. I am glad to delay my question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota when I have concluded.

On Sunday last, as was announced, all of these materials which are now en route to North China finally were placed under strict export control. In other words, none of this material could leave any American port today without proper export license, and I am sure that no such license would be granted to permit these strategic materials to get into the hands of Communist China. Note that the materials listed here are cargoes which have left only from the one port of New York. It is fair to assume that

other cargoes of strategic materials from other ports are now on the high seas in other United States ships bound for Communist China.

It is indeed shocking to learn that these amounts of materials are being carried to the very people who at this moment are slaughtering American fighting men in North Korea. When we began this investigation a number of weeks ago, after the able senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], really initiated the move, it was surprising to discover so many obvious loopholes in the Nation's export-control program as it affected Communist-dominated areas. Everything possible was done to cause these loopholes to be plugged. As I said before, the Office of International Trade now has taken steps to tighten these export controls; but it is impossible to understand why this action was not taken months ago.

However, nothing is now being done, nor as far as we know, is anything now being planned, to stop the strategic materials which are now afloat in American bottoms bound for Communist North China. It is for that reason that we think it a public duty to demand that prompt and effective action be taken to prevent that material from falling into Communist hands.

This information concerning the shipments now on the high seas has just come to us, and there has not been opportunity to discuss the matter with officials in the executive departments. However, it is imperative that the Executive branch take every step possible to prevent delivery of these shipments. The Department of Commerce should explore every means; and, if necessary, it is hoped the President will consider invoking his authority to deny these supplies to the enemy. If no authority can be found, then the Executive branch should ask Congress at once to give them the right to remove these cargoes. If some action is not taken, it is my firm conviction that these ships will be placed into the hands of our enemies materials which will assist them in warring against us.

Mr. President, in these efforts to prevent valuable materials from being delivered to Communist areas from United States ports—and I note again that they are being carried in ships flying the American flag—I regret to say that we have achieved results only after the matter was brought forcibly to public attention. With this in mind, I have placed the entire situation before the Senate, so that our membership and the public at large may know what is transpiring.

Arguments have been made by those who would continue to trade with North China; but with American men fighting and dying and facing annihilation at the hands of the Communist Chinese forces, it would seem to be high time to stop "business as usual." According to published statements from official sources, we have continued much of our free trade with North China because the United States obtained from that country more in the form of valuable imports than we are sending them in these strategic exports. Our investigation has convinced me that for several months past we have not been receiving much

of strategic value from North China that we could not obtain in other places. Included in the imports received from North China mainly are normal civilian items, such as hog bristles, hides, feathers, textiles, tea, dried eggs, and other foodstuffs.

Based on the available facts, it would seem to be sheer stupidity to continue to allow American goods to get into North China, or to permit American ships to carry any goods into that area. I am reliably informed—and we sought the advice of some of the very highest authorities in Government departments—that we could cut off all China trade this minute without impairing our defense program in any way.

Of course, if we cut off all civilian trade, it will result in some hardships to American businessmen engaged in the China trade. But it is also clear that for every dollar we give to North China for nonessential imports, we make a dollar available to them for the purchase of war materials from other nations in the world who may still insist on doing business as usual.

I, therefore, propose that our trade with North China be stopped instantly and that a complete embargo be placed on all shipments to those ports.

Objection may be raised to a complete cessation of trade with Communist China, on the basis that our shipping and business interests will sustain losses. However, when we think of the thousands of gallant young marines fighting in their bare feet in the snow; when we realize the agonies of cold and disaster suffered by our Army forces in retreat before the overwhelming masses of their enemies; when we recall the round-the-clock dangers to which our Air Force pilots have subjected themselves in an effort to cover the hard-pressed forces, there can be no possibility of question as to the choice to be made.

Mr. President, one American life is worth more than all the hog bristles that could be imported from China. The safety of our American fighting men far outweighs any financial gains that might have to be forgone because of the imposition of a strict embargo.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Maryland for the outstanding work he has done in connection with this matter. I had to leave the Capital for the recent campaign; and I left with the Senator from Maryland this very important inquiry, in which he has done such an able job by clearing up the matter during our absence. I wish to commend him for the work he has done. I think he has rendered a great service not only to the American people as a whole, but, in particular, to the Senate, especially in view of the condition in which we now find ourselves. At this time I wish to commend him publicly for what he has done.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, I should like to repeat what I said before, namely, that it was the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] who really initiated this matter and brought to the attention of the Senate the first report

of questionable shipments, without which I do not think the investigation would have begun then. So the Senator from Washington is to be thanked in the premises.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask a question of the very able Senator from Maryland: Who are the exporters who hold licenses and now are shipping or exporting the strategic materials to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I shall be very glad to supply the Senator with any names or detailed information, all of which we have. I may say that in public hearings we summoned to Washington a number of exporters whose names we found on the export declarations or on the ships' manifests, and from them we gathered information as to the various circumstances under which the shipments were made.

Mr. THYE. Are many of those exporters old, reliable firms which have been recognized in the export field for years past; or are there some new firms, persons who have obtained licenses in recent months or years, who now are in that export business?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Most of them are export firms which have been engaged in the business for quite an appreciable length of time. Some of them have entered this particular field in relatively recent times. In other words, apparently they were requested very urgently by persons in North China to bring about purchases. I have in mind particularly 4,500,000 pounds of pure copper which came from Japan all the way to New York, and then was transhipped around the world, back to North China. That was handled by a firm which had not theretofore been engaged in the export trade.

Mr. THYE. The Commerce Department has a committee which passes upon applications for export licenses, does it not?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. THYE. That committee within the Commerce Department should in the first instance, ascertain the background of those who apply for such licenses, and why they make application for export licenses, and in that way safeguard against the making of just such shipments as the copper shipment which has been mentioned by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the policy of importing dried, powdered eggs into the United States, when we have huge surpluses of powdered eggs on hand, seems to be the very height of folly.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I have watched with great interest the development of these facts by the Senator from Maryland, and I wish to commend him most highly. At the same time, I am amazed that we have to argue about a subject of this sort.

Let me ask the Senator from Maryland why we could not impound the cargoes which are in the ships at sea, by informing the exporters that their licenses will be revoked if they do not withhold those goods from China.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Possibly the entire fault does not lie with the shippers. These cargoes undoubtedly left American ports when the particular items in question were not on the so-called positive list; that is to say, the Office of International Trade had not then banned the shipment of those goods. We think that should have been done long ago. In certain instances we asked them to place on the positive list the shipment of certain materials.

So particular shipments such as those to which I have referred might have been made legally, in the sense that those materials and supplies were not on the positive list, and therefore did not need a license to be shipped.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield further to me, to permit me to ask another question of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am glad to reply to questions.

Mr. STENNIS. Even though the materials were entirely legally shipped, when they left the United States ports, in view of the fact that the ships fly the American flag, could not the Commerce Department order those ships stopped at any place they might wish to do so?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce, could modify the present regulations and could prevent the delivery and discharge of those cargoes to the consignees.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator does not receive assurances that such action will be taken or that such results will be brought about, will not the Senator introduce in the Senate proposed legislation of an emergency nature to cover this matter?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I shall be very pleased to do so. As a matter of fact, I am determined to do so if the executive branch does not act.

That is why I suggested, in the statement I have made today, that the Department of Commerce might take effective action promptly. Over the week end the Department of Commerce took action which henceforth will require the issuance of licenses for certain shipments. I think they can take immediate action in respect to these cargoes. However, if they do not, I think other action should be taken.

Mr. STENNIS. In my opinion the Senator will certainly have the wholehearted support of the entire Congress in respect to obtaining immediate results in connection with this matter, which is entirely of an emergency nature.

Again I wish to commend the Senator for his very fine presentation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to join with the other Senators in com-

mending the outstanding job which has been done by the junior Senator from Maryland in this regard, and I am particularly pleased to hear him recommend today that strong action be taken forthwith to embargo these shipments to Red China. I think one of the great weaknesses in the program to date is—and I wonder whether the Senator will not agree with me—that, first, there was a difference between the so-called prohibited list of the United States and that of the British Government, with respect to items which they were allowing to go to Hong Kong, for instance; and second, we must recognize the fact that in dealing with an aggressor power, as we are doing in Red China today, anything that helps their economy strengthens them in their hold upon their own population and their ability to make war against us. Therefore, this trade cannot be limited to a few selected items, but an entire embargo should be placed against them, so as to help disrupt the internal economy of Communist China, and thus in turn give aid to the non-Communist forces within China and the guerrilla movement, so that they can take effective action which will prevent or relieve the pressure against our forces now in Korea. Does the Senator not agree with that?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I agree entirely with the statement made by the Senator from California, and, to give an illustration of what has happened, let me say that some time ago when we sought the action and brought to the attention of Federal officials the facts with respect to very large shipments, the quantities having aroused our suspicions, it was argued by them that the articles shipped were used for civilian purposes. We now find that much of the material has gone into the making of uniforms; and, as the Senator from California indicates, commodities which of course could be used for entirely civilian purposes, nevertheless have been employed to strengthen the industrial and the military potential of Communist China.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield further to enable me to ask a question of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator from Maryland not agree also that for some of the commodities which are sent from Communist China to this country, the Chinese Communists are permitted to get dollar exchange, which in turn they use in the markets of Hong Kong to buy more strategic materials, which we ourselves would not permit to be shipped? So, again, not only is the economy of Communist China strengthened but its warmaking potential is also strengthened, and its efforts to drive American forces out of Korea are aided.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is unquestionably the case.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I desire further to yield to the Senator from Maryland, if

there are further questions. Before doing so, however, I merely wanted to add in connection with the present debate on this matter that since my return, the Senator from Maryland and I have had conferences on this subject, and we expect to do everything we can within the authority of the Merchant Marine Committee to stop such shipments as have been referred to. We think a more flagrant violation exists in that many American citizens owning vessels flying the Panamanian flag and carrying American-purchased goods, are doing exactly the same thing that we are now trying to prevent in the case of vessels flying the American flag. It is even a more flagrant violation than in the latter case.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator from Washington not admit, however, that if we wanted to make an effective naval blockade of the China coast, we should prevent action under any flag, whether it be British, Panamanian, Chinese Communist, or any other, in the way of unloading cargos from ships there? The only way it can be done is by establishing an effective naval blockade, in retaliation for the overt aggression which has taken place in Korea.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator from California. Of course, there first comes the question of an effective blockade of the China Sea. That is one thing. I know a little bit about that. There has been blockade-running and pirating in that area for many years, perhaps for 200 or 300 years. I think we can establish such a blockade. But I believe we should take some drastic action here in regard to American citizens who, under a foreign flag, are making money by engaging in the same kind of traffic.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. With the permission of the Senator from Washington, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland two questions, by which I intend to reinforce the comments and observations made by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] in regard to this subject.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I shall be very glad to answer.

Mr. MORSE. I have but two questions: First, is it or is it not true that the President of the United States, under the powers he has in this hour of emergency, has the authority to stop the transport of these goods, if he cares to exercise the authority?

Mr. O'CONNOR. My answer to the Senator from Oregon is that, in my opinion, the President has. It was for that reason that I mentioned, in the statement I made, that it was to be hoped that the Department of Commerce would take immediate action; and, lacking that, while I did not undertake to tell the President what to do, it was hoped that

he would seek the use of his emergency powers, or any other powers he might have, to bring about the desired result. In the opinion of the Senator from Maryland, I may say to my friend the Senator from Oregon, the President does possess that authority.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Maryland, and wish to say that I agree with his conclusion that the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, in this hour of emergency, has that power. I desire to express not only the hope that he will exercise it but to express the thought and to make the statement on the floor of the Senate today that I think it is his clear duty to proceed to exercise that authority without further delay.

The second question I desire to ask the Senator from Maryland, which bears upon the point made by the Senator from California in respect to Hong Kong, is this: Is it not also true that in this hour of great crisis, at least for our country, so far as our boys in Korea are concerned, we have a right to call upon Great Britain to live up to her moral obligations under the United Nations, and to take the steps necessary to see to it that Hong Kong is not used as a means and a device for Communist China to carry on a more effective war against American boys in Korea?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I wish to say in answer to the Senator from Oregon that I think his point is very well taken. We have already ascertained that quantities of materials much greater than have hitherto been sent to Hong Kong have gone there recently. In our efforts to ascertain their ultimate destination, we received information that unquestionably they went into Communist China hands. So I think the point made by the Senator from Oregon is undoubtedly a very good one, and I believe there is sound foundation for it.

Mr. MORSE. I may say, most respectfully, that I hope the attention of the Prime Minister of Great Britain will be called to the fact that there is a strong view in the Congress of the United States that Great Britain, through Hong Kong, is aiding and abetting the Communist Chinese in connection with the Korean War.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield so that I may address a question to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like in line with what the Senator has just been discussing, to inquire whether he does not agree with me that, at least with respect to some of the nations which, for some reason or other, have been unable to contribute the amount of help to meet the aggression in Korea that the Government and the people of the United States have contributed, the least they can do is to stop giving their moral and material support to Communist China? Is not that the very least they can do?

Mr. MORSE. My answer is an emphatic "Yes."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall yield for one or two more questions, though we have some pending business to attend to. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I came into the Senate Chamber late during this discussion, and I did not hear all of the remarks of the able Senator from Maryland and his report upon the results of the investigation he has been conducting thus far. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland whether, in the course of this investigation, and in his efforts to stop these shipments to China, he has had any assurance from the responsible parties, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of State, or others, that the shipment of goods and materials to China is being stopped, or will be stopped?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, I may say in answer to the Senator from Arkansas that the answer we received has been in the nature of action taken by the Department of Commerce in successive steps; which action, I again say, I regret was not taken a long time ago. Unquestionably, had it been taken, sizable quantities of these supplies would not have reached their destination. But, during the past week, if I may add this further thought, in fairness to the Department of Commerce, they took action. They took action in placing a general requirement that henceforth all shipments to China must be under licenses. But that does not mean that shipments will not be made; but that those seeking to make them must obtain export licenses.

Mr. McCLELLAN. One more question. I ask the able Senator whether in his opinion there is such lack of cooperation among the executive branches of the Government that, under the conditions now existing, it is advisable for the Congress to act immediately to stop this traffic?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that if action is not taken in this particular case—which I think is a glaring instance, at this moment, 6 months after the Communists in Korea undertook their offensive—if action is not taken in this instance, I think the Senator will see further action in this Chamber.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I commend the able Senator from Maryland for having brought this revelation of conditions to the attention of the American people; and I may say the American people are outraged by them, and rightfully so. There ought to be some power in the American Government which can stop this character of traffic. If it cannot be stopped by the executive branch, then the Congress should act.

Mr. KEM and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely want to conclude the discussion on this point by saying to the Senator from Arkansas that this matter was, of course, called to the attention of the Senate last Sep-

tember by the Senator from Maryland and myself, and at that time—let us be fair about it—conditions were much different from what they are now. To follow this up, the Senator from Maryland and I are now asking for a complete embargo, not for export licenses. I feel sure we are going to find a response to this proposal. In the meantime, certain American shippers who have not been wholly at fault have been involved in this traffic; but the real fault lies—we may as well be honest about it, and I am sure that the Senator from Maryland, in view of the very able investigation which he has conducted, will agree with me—lies with the British, who are still doing business as usual through Hong Kong. That fact was called to the attention of the Senate in August by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] and myself. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] joined us in calling the matter to the attention of the Senate. I believe it is appropriate at this time that the Senate call the subject to the attention of the very distinguished visitor from England who is in the city today.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I commend the Senator. However, I do not know what authority we have over the commerce of Great Britain. We do have authority over our own commerce, and can control it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We do not have any control over Great Britain's commerce. Whatever can be done is being done. It is a national disgrace that ships should be in the Far East with such materials.

The Senator from Maryland has been very vigilant, and I am certain that he will be able to get some concrete results.

Mr. KEM and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield; if so to whom?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

#### CONFERENCES BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND PRIME MINISTER ATTLEE

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and other Senators I submit a resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 371), submitted by Mr. KEM (for himself, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SCHOEPEL, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. THYE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. DONNELL, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. NIXON, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. MALONE, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. JENNER, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. ECTON), was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that, after the discussions now being carried on between the President and Prime Minister Attlee have been concluded, the President should forthwith make a full and complete report concerning the same to the Senate; and that the President should not enter into any understandings or agreements with the Prime Minister which might have

the effect of committing the United States to any course of action, except by treaty entered into with the advice and consent of the Senate in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. KEM. The purpose of this resolution is to prevent a second Yalta or a second Potsdam.

During and after World War II, our leaders took a so-called calculated risk that they could do business with Stalin. They gambled—and our people lost. As a result, we find ourselves in greater danger than ever before in history. The decision as to how to meet the present crisis must be sound and realistic. We cannot afford to take more calculated risks with the security of our people.

A crucial conference is now under way between the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain. We learn from the press that the principal items on the agenda are the rapidly deteriorating situation in Korea, and what steps are to be taken to meet the challenge of Red China and the Soviet Union.

This conference is being conducted in a supersecret atmosphere. We do not know what has been decided. We do know that the decisions made will be far-reaching in their implications. They may well mean life or death for millions of Americans.

The Congress, the elected representatives of the people, must exercise fully its constitutional duties to prevent one man, or a small group of men, from again embarking on a course of disaster.

Article II, section 2 of the Constitution provides:

The President \* \* \* shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Webster's defines a treaty as "an agreement or arrangement made by negotiation or diplomacy."

If an "agreement or arrangement" results from the diplomatic negotiations now under way, it should be submitted to the Senate for ratification as required by the Constitution. That is exactly what the resolution I have introduced is designed to accomplish. Nothing more—nothing less.

I anticipate the argument may be raised that to follow such a procedure would tip our hand to the enemy. Therefore, the people must not learn of the plan agreed upon until it has already been put into effect.

Let us not delude ourselves into thinking we can be safe by sticking our heads in the sand. We spent millions of dollars in an effort to prevent Stalin from obtaining the secret of the atomic bomb. Yet one was soon exploded behind the iron curtain. It was made possible only by secrets stolen from America.

The fathers, mothers, sons, and daughters of America should know in advance what they are getting into. After all, this is our country. It is the blood of our people that will be shed. A decision reached in accordance with the principles of our Constitution should determine when and where it shall be shed.

For my part, I greatly prefer such a decision to the combined judgment of

those now sitting at the conference table in the Blair House.

We have learned by experience, Mr. President, that government by guess and intuition is no substitute for government by the Constitution. During World War II, a Chief Executive of the United States entered into far-reaching agreements with representatives of powerful foreign nations, including Britain, at Tehran and Yalta. His successor entered into equally far-reaching agreements with foreign representatives, including Mr. Attlee, at Potsdam.

The calamitous Yalta deal—which sold China down the river to the Reds—was made in secret. The advice of the Senate was not obtained—and apparently not desired. And the world-shaping agreements made at Yalta, as in the case of those made at Tehran, were not ratified by the Senate, or even submitted to it. Today, nearly 6 years after the Yalta Conference, we still do not know exactly what took place.

In Potsdam, in August 1945, the present incumbent of the White House followed the example set by his predecessor. The negotiations at Potsdam, in which Mr. Attlee took part, were conducted for the most part in secret. The Senate played no part. The agreements made were not submitted to it as required by the Constitution. And again, as at Yalta, Stalin received practically everything he wanted.

Are we unwilling to learn from experience? Is it not time to put the brakes on secret huddlers? Have we not drunk the cup of unconstitutional government to the bitter dregs?

Mr. President, I have no illusions or delusions as to the superior wisdom of Members of Congress. I do have an abiding faith in our constitutional processes. When a proposed course of action is tested in the crucible of debate on the floor of the Senate or House, reports are carried throughout the Nation via newspaper, radio, and television. Editors, commentators, and columnists express their opinions. The people are able to inform themselves as to the pros and cons of the matter under discussion, and to make their decisions known, by letters, telegrams, and so forth to their Representatives in the Congress.

Only by this process can decisions be reached which represent the considered judgment of the American people.

Only by returning to tried and tested principles of government can we end the backtrack, bungle, and botch in our foreign affairs.

The Senate must reaffirm its role in the conduct of our foreign relations.

The issue is this: Are we to have a truly American foreign policy, openly arrived at within the framework of constitutional government? Or is our policy to continue to be a secret, personal substitute?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the appropriate committee. I also ask unanimous consent that the committee to which the resolution is referred be directed to report on it by Friday.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall have to object to the latter request,

because at this time I do not know to which committee the resolution will be referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be compelled to object until I have had an opportunity to confer with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Of course, the Senator from Missouri can renew his request at a later time. The procedure suggested by him at this time is somewhat unusual, and I have not had an opportunity to confer with the chairman or the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Until I have had such opportunity, I shall be forced to object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection and yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the Senator would have any objection to a request that the resolution temporarily lie on the table and that the Senator from Missouri may renew his request after the Senator from Washington has conferred with members of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have no objection.

Mr. KEM. That course is entirely agreeable to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. It seems to me that if the subject is to be considered, regardless of its merits or demerits, the resolution should be brought before the Senate within the next few days. I commend the Senator from Missouri for asking that the resolution be referred to a standing committee, because such committee can consider the resolution and report it either favorably or unfavorably. Therefore, it is the fair way of handling such a resolution. However, in view of the subject matter involved, I should like to ask that sometime during the afternoon the acting majority leader take the opportunity to confer with members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and that the distinguished Senator from Missouri may have an opportunity to renew his request.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that is a fair request.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I have been informed that several other Senators would like to join in sponsoring the resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the names of such Senators may be added to the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The names of the original and additional sponsors appear on the resolution as printed in the RECORD.)

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] today submitted a resolution on behalf of himself and a number of other Senators. I wish to associate myself with the first half of the resolution, because I believe that not only should we have a full and complete report concerning the conversations the

President had with Prime Minister Attlee, but we should have a full report for the people of the United States on the situation up to the present time, so far as such a report can be given without endangering the security of our troops.

I believe that when the people of the country know the facts, they can be relied upon to do the right thing, to do the courageous thing, and to do absolutely all that is necessary.

I do not wish to sign the resolution, because I believe that some agreements or understandings, other than treaties, can properly be entered into without congressional approval; but I believe that whatever is agreed upon should, insofar as can be done without endangering security, be presented as quickly as possible in a full and complete report to those of us in the Senate and to the people of the country. I hope the President will do so.

#### EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 207, which proposes to continue the provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 until February 28, 1951. As has been stated many times, Senate Joint Resolution 207 is merely a stop-gap measure designed to put off a decision which must be taken finally, but which can best be taken at another time. At the present time the Congress is confronted with other pressing problems which will require our full time between now and the first of the year. We must be prepared to answer the international challenges hurled at us, for on our answers will hang the fate of our Nation and of the free world.

My position on rent control is known to the Senate. Earlier this year I introduced a bill which would have strengthened rent control where it was needed, and which would have permitted decontrol where controls were not needed. I felt then that the time for complete decontrol had not yet arrived. I feel even more strongly today that the time for decontrol is not here.

In order to meet the international crisis which faces us, we have enacted the Defense Production Act of 1950 which gives the President authority to allocate materials, and to establish rationing, and wage and price controls. Already the organizations to exercise these controls are being set up and we are straining every sinew to increase our production to meet the deepening world crisis. Without a doubt, we shall soon see the establishment of price controls and wage controls in one form or another. In the face of these efforts to mobilize and protect our national economic structure, how can we permit rent controls to lapse? Surely it is obvious that exorbitant rents are just as inflationary as exorbitant prices. Surely it is just as difficult for the defense worker or the soldier to pay inflated prices for shelter as it is to pay inflated prices for food and clothing.

Already a trend toward increased rents has been noted in those areas where our defense efforts have necessitated the concentration of unusual numbers of persons, either military or civilian. I have in my possession copies of numerous letters from commanders of military installations, indicating the shortage of available housing facilities and deploring increases in rents. It has been pointed out that the continued accumulation of personnel around military and defense installations must continue, and that the charging of exorbitant rents will lead to extreme difficulties in obtaining the necessary personnel to man these defense centers.

In his testimony before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on this bill, Mr. Stuart Symington, chairman of the National Security Resources Board, stated:

Recent experiences already point to some of the effects. For example, the area adjacent to Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., was decontrolled by the housing expediter in September 1949. The recent expansion of military personnel at the fort from a skeleton force to over 35,000 officers and men created a serious shortage of rental housing.

Mr. Eugene M. Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, corroborated this statement before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee by stating:

Furthermore, the present emergency has made it necessary for us to recruit additional civilian personnel and to utilize their services where housing is already at a premium because of various reasons. Accordingly, any rental increases in these areas would make them unattractive to potential civilian employees and would have a very adverse effect upon our efforts to retain trained civilian personnel at these locations.

Do we really need this bill? It has been suggested by one Member of this body that the present Rent Control Act be permitted to expire on December 31, 1950, in order to wipe the slate clean so that the Eighty-second Congress may reexamine the whole issue of rent control on its merits. In my opinion, such a course of action would be detrimental to our defense efforts. It could very well be highly dangerous to our whole economic structure.

Under any conditions, whether or not Senate Joint Resolution 207 is passed, the Eighty-second Congress will be called upon to examine the entire question of rent control. Senate Joint Resolution 207 merely maintains the status quo until that reexamination can take place. On the other hand, if the present act is allowed to expire, it will mean untold hardships for our defense workers and military personnel.

The defense effort will be hampered. The present organization which is administering rent control will be dispersed and an unlimited amount of time and effort will be necessary to set up new criteria for determining rent levels, especially on those units which are decontrolled by reason of the expiration of the present act.

As I said before, this bill would merely continue the status quo. In areas where there will be no concentration of defense effort, the process of decontrol may

continue exactly as it has in the past. In the controlled areas, rent increases may be granted whenever they are found to be justified. The authority of incorporated cities and towns to remove their areas from Federal controls would be unaffected.

This bill may be described as a rear-guard action, a delaying action necessary to give the Eighty-second Congress time to review the whole subject of rent control. If this bill is not enacted, the Eighty-second Congress must start from scratch. If the bill is enacted, it will provide a basis from which to work. It is my earnest hope that Senate Joint Resolution 207 will be enacted into law.

#### THE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM IS WORLD-WIDE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the light of the present critical world-wide situation it seems to me appropriate to make a few observations on some of the issues which are before those who are considering where we go from here. We are aware that there are debates today in the United Nations, and there are conferences now being held, probably at this very moment, between the President of the United States and his advisers and representatives of Great Britain, and I feel called upon by a sense of urgency to express some of the convictions I have on the problems now pending.

Let me say at the beginning, Mr. President, that what is going on is a world-wide fight for freedom. I pause a moment to address a few remarks to our guests from Great Britain. As Prime Minister Attlee said a few days ago, trouble always brings us closer together. May it always be thus. We thoroughly reciprocate his sentiments.

Mr. President, we in America are fully conscious of the great sacrifices of Europe in the cause of freedom in our time. We have seen two terrible world wars, and we have seen the countries of Europe devastated. I pay tribute to the heroism that has marked the course of the people of those countries.

We have full faith that their devotion to freedom—and I emphasize the word "freedom"—is undiminished in this time of danger. For a decade we have stood solidly with Europe in the struggle for freedom, and nothing will make us abandon Europe now. But I wish to emphasize that in unity there is strength, and we must find unity in our approach to our present problems.

Unity must include unity of purpose. America takes a world view, and we invite our friends in Europe to do the same. I submit that we cannot have one policy in Europe and another policy in Asia. Some voices are being raised asking us to abandon Asia in order to strengthen Europe. As I see it, such a course would be the utmost folly. To weaken the forces of freedom anywhere is to weaken them everywhere.

A course of appeasement in Asia, a course of rewarding the aggressor or passing over the wrongs of the aggressor, would hearten and strengthen aggressors everywhere, including those in Eu-

rope. It would strike a mortal blow at the Atlantic Pact, which we are now trying to develop and strengthen.

Freedom, justice, and courage know no races and no boundaries. If we only have the courage in this crisis to stand together everywhere and to honor our principles everywhere we will find that our strength is greater than we knew, sufficiently great to hold the front for freedom throughout the world—and I emphasize again the word "freedom."

The issue that is before us today is the clear issue of naked and shameless aggression. If I read the United Nations Charter aright, those who wrote the Charter and the countries which ratified it were determined that aggression by force should be curbed and that principles should be established and means provided to prevent aggression. I wish to refer in this connection to the outstanding address delivered by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] on Monday, and I wish to quote, if I may, two questions he asked, which I repeat and underline. The first is:

Are we now to take the position that human freedom is less worth supporting in Asia than it is in Europe?

That is the first question. The second question is this, and it is likewise the question of the Senator from California:

Is aggression any less dangerous to peace because it has been committed by a larger power?

We do not hesitate to move in and take action against small aggressions. We have been trying to deal with minor aggressions all over the world, but when we have the threat of a great aggression, or the actuality of a great aggression, we are prepared, apparently, to consider the possibility of backing down for the sake of expediency, in order to be safe.

Let me say a word about the first question asked by the Senator from California:

Are we to take the position that human freedom is less worth supporting in Asia than it is in Europe?

I had the privilege in September to be a representative of the United States at the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Dublin, Ireland. At that meeting I heard expressions from representatives of all the nations present, which numbered 30 or 40. Particularly there were present the representatives of the far-eastern countries. I even felt that the far-eastern countries stole the show because they asserted certain principles they were seeking to attain. They tried to point out to the western powers some of the principles we should consider in the present developing world situation. There were at the meeting representatives from India, Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, Indochina, Indonesia, and other areas in the Far East and in the Middle East. They said to us, "You western powers, which lay so much stress on human freedom, should think through seriously what we in the Far East have been striving for. We have been striving to get away from superimposed controls. We have been striving to get away

from the old style of imperialistic colonialism or the exploitation of weaker peoples. All we want is to be turned loose and to be enabled to find out our own destiny, to be a part of the family of nations, without superimposed controls. We do not want to be taken over."

This was said right in an open meeting, and I talked with those representatives afterward. They said in that meeting, "We do not want to be taken over by communism as China has been taken over. But we are in danger of being taken over unless this aspiration of ours in some way is realized, and unless it is possible for the people of the east to be as free as the people of the west hope to be. All we ask is not money, not alms, but a sympathetic understanding of our plight, the sending of aid wherewith we can build up our economic security, whereby we can supply our own defense."

Mr. President, I say we cannot hold that human freedom is less worth supporting in Asia than it is in Europe. In fact it is my own judgment that the supporting of human freedom in Asia today is one of the keystones on which we can hope to build our security in Europe and throughout the world. Those in Europe who are suggesting even that we should ease up and draw away from Asia in order to be stronger in Europe are in my judgment making a basic, fundamental mistake which they will live to regret.

I am making no charges and no suggestions as to those who may be giving voice to the thought that we should do such things, but I understand it is a part of the conversations which are going on. I think our close friends from Britain must realize the dangers to themselves if they once let down in their support of the aspirations for human freedom which are the background of civilization.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield. Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator from New Jersey, who in my opinion is contributing a great thought to the Senate and to the American people, also feel that possibly our other ally and member of the United Nations, France, is making a mistake with regard to Indochina?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If the Senator will permit me, I will come to his question in a few moments. As the next step in my remarks I was coming to the United Nations. Not merely the United States of America, but the United Nations has put its hand to the plow to put down aggression in Korea. British troops have been fighting with great valor beside our American forces. Is their sacrifice to be thrown away in appeasement of aggression or in withdrawing from what we have sought to do?

Fifty-three nations, large and small, have backed the bold United Nations stand in Korea. If these nations were right in opposing aggression when we were winning, are they wrong in opposing aggression now that we are in trouble?

In a short period of time we seem to have a complete turnover of the picture. There was an enthusiastic response to the call for resistance to aggression when the Korean trouble broke out last June. The United Nations took, as I thought, a correct stand, and moved in to stop aggression. My question is, Are they now to withdraw, because things seem to be going the wrong way?

Twice the aggressor has defied the United Nations. When the defiance came from the North Korean puppets, we of the United Nations fought them and prevailed. Now that the defiance is by Chinese Communists, motivated by Moscow, and the power is 10 times as great, are we to give up and say we were wrong?

There is a difference between being temporarily pushed back, as we were in Bataan, and trying to appease the situation and practically admit that perhaps we had made a mistake, and had better have done something else.

I say we must stand for the right, no matter how great the forces against us, and see it through. The very survival of the United Nations, and of all the United Nations stands for, depends on the courage and firmness in the right of its members at this particular moment.

It is my own judgment that the United Nations may well collapse if we yield or appease during the present aggression. The great danger is that we will retreat in panic. When I say that I do not mean that we may not have to make a military retreat and reconsolidate our forces, and that sort of thing. That can be done, and frequently is, as in the case of Bataan, when it was necessary to retreat and start from another point. We may have to retreat. But the danger is that we may retreat from the basic principles for which we stand, the principles on which the United Nations itself is founded. The big threat to us today is the danger of retreat from fundamental principles. This we must never do anywhere in the world. We know what those principles are. We see a violation of the basic principle of the whole United Nations Charter, which is to resist unjustified aggression or aggression anywhere.

Let me say in answer to the question asked by the Senator from New Mexico: Of course, the principle I am discussing applies to all the nations that are concerned with us in this great enterprise. They all have responsibilities. I understand that in the case of Indochina the French have tried to solve the problem and bring about a free and independent Indochina at the earliest date. It is a difficult problem.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I fully agree with the Senator from New Jersey that if principles are to apply in one place, if they are worth fighting for, if they are worth the sacrifices which are being made in Korea at the moment, then they should apply everywhere in the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Especially after we started with such great ideals when the United Nations was organized some 5 years ago. I believe the Senator from New Jersey is on sound ground when he states that we should not now retreat from principles. We may have to make a military retreat for the moment, but that should be done only so we can come back and fight again to carry out the principles adopted by the United Nations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from New Mexico is entirely correct. He expresses the very thought I am trying to express.

The cause of freedom—and I again emphasize the word "freedom"—is world-wide and indivisible. Freedom can prevail only if the free people of the world are united and working together to oppose despotism in any form in which it may appear.

Our unity does not depend on any temporary success or expediency. It does not depend on where the battle lines are drawn. It does not depend on the military question of continuing the fight in Korea or making an honorable retreat, or moving back and consolidating our lines. The fact that we are forced to do that by the sheer force of numbers is no disgrace. That is one of the incidents of military operations. But I am arguing that there should be no retreat from principle, from what the United Nations stands for, for what we all stand for, and that is human freedom under Almighty God.

Mr. President, our unity lies only in our common moral purpose. If through appeasement we should surrender that moral purpose and the principles for which we stand and for which the United Nations stand, in order to gain a moment of respite in Korea or for any other reason, we would break the movement for unity of the free world everywhere. The fall of all Europe would follow soon after. We cannot afford to run to cover and safety when great principles are involved.

If we maintain our united moral purpose, the purpose of the United Nations, then from that purpose we can develop the proper strategy in every quarter of the globe. We will not always be winning, but in the end we will win if we are always in the right.

As we stood together in June against the shock of aggression, I plead that we stand together now, everywhere in the world. No matter how difficult the task may be, if we have the united will to do it, we will find the means; we will save the United Nations as the great hope of the world for a lasting peace.

During the delivery of the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AIKEN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I dislike very much to interrupt the Senator at this particular moment, but he has mentioned Almighty God. I wonder whether the Senator will

be so kind as to permit me to read at this time, for about half a minute, a letter with reference to God and the situation in the United Nations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be very glad to have the distinguished Senator do so, if he is willing to have his remarks appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, so that the continuity of my statement will not be interfered with.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly, and I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am very glad to have the Senator from New Mexico read the letter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post carries a letter written by a clergyman of this city to the Post. His letter is along the same lines as the remarks the distinguished Senator from New Jersey has been making. The letter reads as follows:

#### GOD IN THE UN

More than 5 years ago the United Nations decided that God should not be invoked at its meetings. The chief reason for the rejection of the Creator from the momentous deliberations of this organization was the fear that any mention of the Supreme Being might be offensive to our "good allies," the atheistic representatives of the Soviet Government.

Today, as we look back on the most appalling record of futility and confusion ever presented by an assembly of presumably intelligent statesmen, it should be evident that there is a connection between the exclusion of God from the UN and the colossal failures that have characterized its efforts. Isn't it possible that if the delegates, from now on, humbly call on God for light and guidance before each session, they will be more successful? In these critical days of anxiety and fear it might be well to try this plan.

Very Rev. F. J. O'CONNELL,

C. S. R., S. T. D., Dean of Theology,  
Catholic University of America.

WASHINGTON.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico, in commenting on the letter he has just read, that I have felt, as he implies, that what is going on in the world is a war between materialistic, communistic atheism, and the Western, Christian tradition in which all of us believe. I have always taken the position, being a man of faith, that it would have been a most enlightening and helpful and uplifting thing if the United Nations could have found a ground on which its meetings could have been opened by the invocation of Divine aid.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

#### UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MCCARTHY obtained the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes; if it is understood that by doing so I shall not lose the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Anderson	Hoey	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Myers
Bricker	Hunt	Neely
Butler	Ives	Nixon
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Kefauver	Pepper
Chapman	Kem	Robertson
Chavez	Kerr	Russell
Clements	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Connally	Knowland	Schoeppel
Cordon	Langer	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Leahy	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Long	Stennis
Eastland	Lucas	Taft
Ecton	McCarran	Taylor
Ellender	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McFarland	Thye
George	McKellar	Tydings
Gillette	McMahon	Watkins
Gurney	Magnuson	Wherry
Hayden	Malone	Wiley
Hendrickson	Maybank	Williams
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, it is unnecessary to tell the Senate, the country, or the world that America is facing the greatest military disaster in its entire history. Day by day and hour by hour the situation grows blacker, blacker for the world, blacker for the United States, and more particularly is it painfully blacker for over 100,000 American young men in Korea.

At this very moment the mothers and wives of those young men are treading deeply into the valley of darkness and despair. It is not necessary to use high-sounding words to describe the situation to our men in Korea. Those men, their mothers, fathers, and wives, see the situation in its elemental ugliness. They are face to face with facts—facts that cannot be escaped by pious platitudes. It is high time for all, including those responsible for administration policy, to get down to rugged reality, to look at conditions as they actually are today, and not as we wish them to be.

It is not too late for a realistic examination or a reexamination, if you will, of the situation to produce some lessening of the perils of those gallant men now fighting on one of the frontiers of freedom. Upon the results of such an examination we must chart a course of effective action, and we must be prompt in doing so. Promptness, Mr. President, is no less required than realism, we are like the firemen who debate while the house burns down.

In this time of peril, it is the duty of everyone—Democrat, Dixiecrat, or Republican—to work in the national interest. We are all, first of all, Americans. But it is not in the national interest to unite in support of error, or of policies that have failed. Unity then would only compound the damage of the past. World history is littered with the corpses of nations which were united behind bad leadership following the wrong course.

Let us briefly examine the three plans which this administration has used in three of the major areas of the world in the last 5 years.

No. 1: The Forrestal plan, which Truman fortunately adopted for Greece and Turkey. As we all know, the Forrestal plan, simply stated, was to give all the necessary military aid to people who themselves were willing to fight communism—enough military aid to make them strong enough to withstand international communism. While sufficient economic aid was given to make the military aid effective and workable, the emphasis at all times under the Forrestal plan was to be on military aid. The Forrestal plan, as we know, proved very successful.

No. 2: The Acheson-Marshall plan for all of western Europe, which was directly opposite to the Forrestal plan for Greece and Turkey. It consisted of giving the maximum economic aid with no thought whatsoever of any military defense of western Europe. In fact, the over-all plan was to build up the area economically and keep it defenseless from a military standpoint.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that the Marshall plan, as originally proposed by General Marshall, included Russia among its beneficiaries?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is certainly true.

The Acheson-Marshall plan fitted perfectly with Communist Russia's desire for a power vacuum in all of western Europe. On paper, as we know, there was a material and welcome change in the Acheson-Marshall plan for western Europe over a year ago. The change is on paper. At that time, as the Senate will recall, we voted vast sums of money for the military defense of western Europe. As of today, however, western Europe is still defenseless, while our State Department holds lengthy conferences with European leaders on such questions as whether or not an additional 500 policemen can safely be allowed to Western Germany.

No. 3: The Hiss-Acheson-Jessup-Lattimore-Vincent plan to turn all of Asia over to the Communists and to then cooperate with those friendly Communists. In other words, in one area of the world the plan was to fight international communism with economic aid; in another area it was to fight international communism with military aid; and in the third area it was to turn everything over to the Communists.

I know it is unnecessary to comment upon the fact that of the three plans the only one which has been successful from the American standpoint is the Forrestal plan as applied to Greece and Turkey. The most disastrous for America and most successful from the standpoint of international communism was, of course, the Hiss-Acheson-Jessup-Lattimore-Vincent plan for Asia. As of today the failure of the Acheson-Marshall plan for western Europe has not yet been demonstrated to the American people. Suffice to say we are creating in Europe exactly what Russia desires, namely, an area which is becoming economically prosperous, but completely undefended—a power vacuum. In Stalin's wildest and most optimistic dreams

of 5 years ago, he could hardly have pictured a 5-year development more favorable to international atheistic communism.

Of the three plans the Hiss-Acheson plan for Asia should be completely and unequivocally repudiated in its every vicious detail. The Forrestal plan, which worked so well in Greece and Turkey, obviously must receive wholehearted approval; and the Acheson-Marshall plan for Europe should be completely changed so as to conform to the Forrestal plan for Greece and Turkey.

Now let us look briefly at the State Department's plan for Asia insofar as it affects the life and death of this Nation and the life and death of 100,000 of our young men in Korea—the plan to turn all of Asia over to international communism, or, putting it in Lattimore's words, to "allow them to fall, but do not let it appear that we pushed them." This plan was proceeding according to schedule until Truman on June 26 ordered MacArthur to defend South Korea. This, of course, was directly contrary to Acheson's previous public statements in which he publicly assured the Chinese Communists that neither Formosa nor Korea was within our defense perimeter, thereby inviting the Communists to move into Korea and Formosa. While it appeared upon the surface on June 26 that Truman was scrapping the disastrous Hiss-Acheson-Jessup-Lattimore-Vincent plan, actually the reversal and the scrapping did not go deep. It can now be seen that the Communists sustained only a temporary, minor loss, that is, temporary and minor unless—unless at this late date we scrap the entire Acheson plan, lock, stock, and barrel, and scrap the men who were responsible for the plan.

For example, as we all recall, part of Truman's order to the Seventh Fleet was that it prevent the Republic of China from taking any military action against the Chinese Communists on the mainland. Truman's orders to the Seventh Fleet also were to break Chiang Kai-shek's blockade of the Communist mainland. This released over a quarter of a million Communist troops which were stationed upon the mainland of China opposite Formosa.

Strangely—and rather significantly—in Acheson's speech of last week he admitted that he knew that those troops started moving north to the Manchurian border after they were assured by the Acheson-inspired Truman order that they could safely leave the China coast and there would be no danger of Chiang Kai-shek moving over.

As a result of this Acheson-inspired Truman order, at this moment a quarter of a million troops which had been immobilized on the China coast by Chiang Kai-shek's forces are now surrounding and cutting to pieces American forces in North Korea. Those Chinese Communists are using equipment which would not have gotten to them had the American fleet not been ordered to break Chiang Kai-shek's blockade of the China coast. This double barreled action to aid the Chinese Communists was not United Nations action. It was action taken by President Truman under the advice of Dean Gooderham Acheson.

At this point I should like to pay tribute to a Senator who has been doing a most important work, and who made a great speech on the floor of the Senate today. I refer to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR]. He is performing a valuable service in attempting to stop the flow of these goods, even at this late date.

Let us keep that part of the picture clearly in mind. While the President was ordering our young men to fight and die in the battle against Communists in Korea, Acheson was saying to his Chinese Communist friends—the "agrarian reformers": "Don't worry, the Acheson hand will again be quicker than the Truman brain. I will have him sign an order under which the Seventh Fleet will make it unnecessary for you to guard the China mainland from Chiang Kai-shek's 500,000 troops on Formosa. I will insert in that order a provision forbidding the continuance of the blockade of the China coast by Chiang Kai-shek. Then you can get the necessary war matériel and oil which Chiang has prevented reaching your armies."

But that was only one of the major services which our State Department has rendered the Chinese Communists. With half a million Chinese Communists in Korea—I believe it is now 1,000,000—killing American men, Acheson says, "Now let's be calm; let's not take hasty action; let's do nothing to alienate the friendship of the Chinese Communists who are killing our men. Let's keep them friendly."

With the rim of the world on fire, with the death toll of American men mounting by the hour, the great Red Dean asks us to be calm and patient. It is like advising a man whose home is being pillaged and burned, whose family is being killed, to be calm and not take hasty action for fear he might alienate the affection of the murderers.

Such has been the blueprint for disaster. It doesn't take a military or diplomatic expert to tell the American people that if we continue with the same plans and the same planners 100,000 men will be sacrificed on Acheson's altar of double dealing, and western civilization will have been dealt a staggering blow.

So clear is the answer to the question of what can and must be done that the question almost answers itself.

First. Instead of calmness and patience with the Chinese Communists, what is needed is speedy action of the roughest and toughest kind of which we are capable. The time for patience is past. The time for action is at hand. General Douglas MacArthur should be immediately given the authority to hit the Chinese Communists wherever, whenever, and however he thinks it necessary so long as they are killing American men. We cannot and must not wait on United Nations fiddling while our men are dying. Every minute we wait means more American dead, and new agony and tears for additional American families.

Second. Give the Chinese Republic the airplanes, tanks, guns, and ammunition which are needed to supply the million guerrillas with which they have con-

tact on the China mainland. This will force the withdrawal of vast numbers of Communist troops from the Korean battlefields.

Third. Reverse the Truman-Acheson order to the Seventh Fleet so that Chiang may make such military movements against the China mainland as he and General MacArthur consider advisable. Practically every one of our military men—in fact, every one with whom I have discussed the question—agrees that this action will force the Chinese to withdraw additional vast numbers of troops from the Korean fight, even if Chiang never moves to the mainland. If the threat is there it will force the Chinese to withdraw additional vast numbers of troops from the Korean fight.

Fourth. Reverse the Acheson inspired Truman order to the Seventh Fleet so that Chiang Kai-shek may again blockade the Communist ports, and, of course, have our Navy take part in the blockade.

Fifth. In Japan we must have immediate peace for a free, sovereign and democratic Japan with or without Russian concurrence. In these times it is ridiculous for the United States to be in the position of defending the Japanese. Japanese rearmament must proceed at full speed, but on a basis similar to that of the North Atlantic Pact. To forestall the danger of an independent and remilitarized Japan we can establish a western Pacific pact consisting of the United States, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Japan, and the Republic of China.

Sixth. In western Europe we should immediately shift from the Acheson-Marshall plan to the Forrestal type of plan, which was effective in Greece and Turkey—the plan to immediately build up the military potential in western Europe, creating an army not of American young men, but of European young men, including the tens of thousands of Germans and Spaniards who are willing to fight against Communist aggression. We should be done with the Acheson idea that only American boys can die in the fight against communism.

At home and abroad we can little afford projects of economic defense at the expense of military defense. Any policy or program that does not contribute to rapid and increased military strength on the part of the West cannot be in our best interests. This must be made quite clear to our European allies, for we cannot afford haggling in debate when the necessity of the times demands cooperation, wisdom, and quick action. In this connection it must be kept in mind that Russia wants uncontrolled inflation or economic collapse in the United States. We must deal with the inflation problem at home, and clearly recognize that one of Russia's war weapons is economic warfare, and that we may have gravely overreached ourselves in economic commitments abroad.

Seventh. Through the prestige of the United States and the appeal of the American ideal as demonstrated, we have an additional vast source of manpower which we must not fail to utilize. On the basis of, say, 5 years honorable

American military service we should establish quotas similar to our prewar immigration quotas, but without the unfortunate oriental exclusion clauses for those who will serve our cause. Upon completion of this service these valuable allies should be granted full citizenship in the United States. Plans should be made not only to avail ourselves of this source of manpower now, but also if and when Russia succeeds in occupying western Europe.

Eighth. Request withdrawal of recognition of the Chinese Communist government by all those nations to whom we have been giving billions of dollars to strengthen them so as to resist communism.

I think it is extremely important that we notify those European nations that this is a two-way street. When we spend billions of dollars trying to aid them, when the chips are down we should be able to call upon them for something in return. Certainly it is not calling upon them for much to ask them to withdraw recognition of the government which is conducting undeclared war against our young men. Failure on the part of any of them to do so should be considered by us as proof positive of their bad faith and lack of sincerity, and that they have been obtaining our aid under false pretenses. Such aid should immediately cease to those nations who refuse this request.

We know that at Yalta we were betrayed. We know that since Yalta the leaders of this Government by design and ignorance have continued to betray us. The depth and foulness of that betrayal no man can as yet outline for those of us who are its victims. We also know that the same men who betrayed America are still leading America. The traitors must no longer lead the betrayed. The international criminals must no longer splatter the pages of history with American blood. We of America are infinitely stronger than those who betrayed us would have the world believe. We are tougher than they have the courage to admit. We are more free than they wish us to be, and we are ready to fight for what we know is right, but we must not fight under the leadership of perfumed, dilettante diplomats. We cannot fight successfully under the leadership of those who are either half loyal or disloyal to what we are fighting for.

Nor do I think that General Marshall should continue his heavy responsibilities at his advanced age, and particularly since he, too, has been heavily involved in the erroneous China policy. I cannot too strongly urge that General Marshall would be infinitely more valuable to the Nation as an elder statesman in Leesburg. If he were there his doctors would be more satisfied, and his talents would be available as needed, as are those of our other fine elderly statesmen.

Within the next few days I intend to discuss in some detail the insidious Communist Party line attacks by inspired and semiofficial press agents of the Government, and by certain of the dangerous party-line radio commenters and news columnists—attacks by the cabal that

hounded Forrestal to death, and did such an efficient job of destroying Chiang Kai-shek in the eyes of the American people, the same cabal that is now making an all-out effort in an attempt to destroy Gen. Douglas MacArthur because he too, even as did James Forrestal and as does Chiang Kai-shek, stands in the way of international atheistic communism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Untold Facts in the Forrestal Case," written by William Bradford Huie, and published in the New American Mercury.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### UNTOLD FACTS IN THE FORRESTAL CASE

In the 20 months since the destruction of James Vincent Forrestal, there has been a creeping realization in this country that what happened was much more than a poignant personal tragedy—that it was a historic national disaster in which a patriot with vision was allowed to be done to death by lesser men.

The disaster is made apparent by events. Louis Johnson, for whose accommodation Forrestal was destroyed, has been loaded with sins and chased into the briar patch. We have suffered 30,000 casualties in Korea who might have been spared had Forrestal's policies prevailed. Thoughtful Americans are, therefore, remembering that it was Forrestal who struggled to arm this Nation for its commitments, and there is a growing inclination to look again at his crucifiers and their cloak holders—at those whom Time magazine identified as "disgruntled politicians, Communists, Zionists, and gossip columnists," and whom the Saturday Evening Post labeled "an ill-assorted group of ideological libertarians."

Much of the truth has thus far been suppressed, but the ghost of Jim Forrestal is not going to be laid until there are reasonable answers to such questions as these:

Why was the attack on Forrestal so reckless and sadistically savage?

Why have his papers been held secret?

Where is the report of those who investigated his death?

Why was the deposed Defense Secretary held a virtual prisoner at Bethesda Naval Hospital—a prisoner who could not be visited by his own priest?

The American people can expect some of the truth within the next few months. Unless the administration can prevent it, there will be a congressional investigation. There will be publication of such of the Forrestal papers as can be wrested from a Defense Department now headed by Gen. George C. Marshall. Meanwhile, this most recent evidence gathered by the Mercury may be helpful.

The Communists, both American and European, had good reason to hate Jim Forrestal: He hated them. He emerged from the Second War dedicated to the destruction of communism. He had opposed every concession to bring Russia into the war against Japan. He fought General Marshall's effort to force Chiang Kai-shek to coalesce with the Chinese Communists. He battled those men in the State Department who tried to give the Mediterranean to Russia. Forrestal sat up nights figuring ways to fight Communists. And he was not only willing to fight them fairly: He was willing to fight their way.

In December 1947, when France was paralyzed by a general transportation strike, Forrestal summoned his most trusted friends to Washington. He told them that necessity demanded the use of dollars in Europe for bribes. He explained that he had spent all of the Defense Department's "non-voucher-

able funds," as well as much of his own money, and that more was needed. His friends produced \$50,000 immediately; the money was carried that night to Paris by an American intelligence officer and paid next day to a prominent Communist leader. The strike ended within 12 hours.

During the Italian elections, in the spring of 1948, Forrestal acted in the same forthright manner. We have taken much credit for our part in that first postwar victory of the west over the Reds. We prayed, we wrote letters, we sent food, we promised Trieste to the Italians—and our side won. But we might have lost had not Forrestal spent private funds on his own responsibility.

When the Italian campaign was hottest, he again summoned his friends. He warned that the election would be lost unless dollars were used to overmatch Red payments to Italian propagandists. His friends produced, in one lot, upwards of \$100,000 in cash, and this was carried by a New York attorney and paid out in the most effective manner.

Before he permitted large dollar contributions to the De Gasperi campaign fund, Forrestal received a promise that never, under any circumstances, would De Gasperi allow Communists in his government. This was at a time when other agencies of our Government were still advocating a coalition with Communists in China.

When the Defense Secretary was reminded that he might suffer grave consequences if his activities were made public, he replied: "Don't worry about that. These are times that demand personal risk. I am ready to take any consequences of this action."

In addition to finance, Forrestal also employed deception. He had no authority to give American tanks to the Italians, but he was, with authority, shipping tanks to Greece. He, therefore, arranged for freighters loaded with Greece-bound tanks to "refuel" at Naples, and while the ships were "refueling," American troops in civilian clothes "broke in" the tanks by driving them down Italian streets in parades with Italian soldiers, thus giving the impression that the tanks had been delivered to Italy.

After the election a cardinal then residing in Rome declared: "The Communists blame Mr. Forrestal for this defeat. They have marked him as their No. 1 enemy. He understands them too well."

Such activities by the Defense Secretary were unknown to the American people, but they were well known to Communist agents in Washington. And these leaders hated and plotted against Forrestal because he hit them where they are weakest, in the venality of their own members. He showed them that two can play their game of justifying means with ends.

A complete report on this phase of Forrestal's tremendous activity will be instructive \* \* \* and it will also explain some of the "sadistic savagery" of the attack on him.

While the Communists were plotting his political, if not his physical, death, Forrestal incurred the hatred of American Zionists. According to the Nation, the Zionists "deplored Forrestal's apparent willingness to place the oil of the Near East above the requirements of political justice in Palestine."

Forrestal explained his position in a letter: "If we are to safeguard western civilization in this crisis, the British and American fleets must have free access to Near Eastern oil. That is a fact, however unpleasant it may be. When there is a crisis aboard a submarine, we close bulkhead doors and drown a third of the crew in order to save the other two-thirds. I am interested in political justice in Palestine, but this interest must remain secondary to my primary interest, which is the protection of America and the west from the gravest threat we have ever faced. No minority has the right to

jeopardize this Nation for its own selfish interest."

The Defense Secretary invited more leftist animosity when he opposed the Morgenthau plan for the destruction of German industry. The plan is now almost universally acknowledged to have been ridiculous.

These twin positions caused a number of writers and commentators, including Drew Pearson and Walter Winchell, to join in what the Saturday Evening Post described as reckless and sadistically savage attacks on Forrestal.

Despite the Zionist hatred of Forrestal, when the private money was being raised for the Italian and French crises, Forrestal's Jewish friends contributed eagerly and generously.

In the fall of 1948, the rest of the United States was engaged in a political campaign, but Forrestal was engaged in a campaign against the Kremlin. It was the year of the Italian elections, the French strikes, the continuing unification battle, the Berlin blockade. Forrestal, with his incredible energy, worked night and day, including Sundays. In 10 years in Washington he had 3 days vacation. He knew from intelligence reports that the Russians had ventured the Berlin blockade because the United States was in the turmoil of an election. He wanted desperately to keep the Defense Department out of the political campaign.

Forrestal was a Democrat. His father, an Irish Catholic contractor at Beacon, N. Y., had been a Cleveland man. Jim Forrestal, at Princeton, and during the years when he had made himself a millionaire in Wall Street, had remained a Democrat and a party contributor. At Roosevelt's invitation he had resigned his \$180,000-a-year job in 1940 and plunged into public service with all his characteristic energy. He was admired by such diverse individuals as Harold Ickes and John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

Forrestal's relations with Truman were friendly but not warm. Forrestal was no poker player, no political opportunist, no professional Legionnaire, no practitioner of the expedient; he was busy and serious. It is possible that he, with his first-rate brain and immense, world-wide experience, was somewhat contemptuous of Truman, but he never revealed it. Instead, even when the President flatly refused to support the \$17,000,000,000 budget for the services, Forrestal did not resign but remained loyal.

However, as Defense Secretary in so dangerous a period, Forrestal was convinced that he should not take an active role in trying to reelect Truman. This enraged the political gang around the White House. They reasoned in this manner: They needed money; Forrestal was the big shot in the Cabinet; he was a millionaire Wall Streeter; he had rich friends; he ought to raise money for Truman.

Thus began the slanders and libels that Forrestal was disloyal to Truman; that he had contributed nothing to the campaign; that he had made a deal with Dewey. All of these were lies. He was completely loyal. He contributed \$6,000 of his own money to the campaign; he asked a number of his friends to contribute. Truman knew of his contribution; so did Louis Johnson. Two reputable Republicans can testify that he refused to discuss even the possibility of his remaining in a Dewey cabinet. But dedicated as he was to the war against communism, he did refuse to blackjack Defense Department suppliers for campaign funds.

One White House pseudo-military figure remarked: "Yeah, that rich s. o. b. has raised a million bucks to buy votes in Europe, but he's giving us chicken feed to buy votes for Truman."

It would perhaps have been better for the country if Forrestal had called in his wealthy friends and explained that he had to raise a million dollars in order to safeguard his job.

But he didn't; Louis Johnson did; so Johnson became the candidate of the Missouri gang for Defense Secretary.

The day after Truman's inauguration in 1949 the campaign to "get Forrestal" was thrown into high gear. The country has seldom seen its like. The Communists, the "ideological libertarians," the Missouri gang, and the columnists manned the mud buckets.

Forrestal was accused of having defrauded the Government in a tax case. He was, of course, a Fascist, a warmonger, a racist, a bedfellow of I. G. Farben and the German cartellists, he bathed in oil—Near Eastern variety—and he smirked over the murder of Jewish babies by Arabs. He was a renegade Catholic, and, as a climax, Pearson reported that he was a personal coward, that he had once abandoned his wife to burglars and run out of the back of the house.

At the height of the campaign a New York publicity agent was heard reassuring a client: "Don't worry; that ——— will crack up in 30 days. He can't take what we're dishing out to him."

Why was it necessary for them to discredit Forrestal? He had tendered the customary resignation to Truman. Why didn't Truman just accept his resignation?

There are two explanations. In the first place, Truman had frightened Johnson by vacillating. When Forrestal had visited Truman after the inauguration, expecting to be fired, Truman had surprised him by saying: "Jim, I want you to stay with me. I know what you're doing, and I want you to stay on and complete the job. You have my complete support."

Truman kept stalling Johnson during January and February, and there was one bitter night for Johnson in New York when he was convinced that Truman, like Roosevelt, had betrayed him and that he wouldn't get the job.

So, in the first place, Forrestal had to be discredited in order to safeguard the job for Johnson; and, in the second place, he had to be discredited in order to make it "politically safe" for Truman to fire him. In present-day politics you can't fire a man without first maligning him.

Under different circumstances Forrestal probably would not have been upset by vituperation. But he was now a dedicated man; he was emotionally involved in his crusade to make this country strong. He regarded Truman and Johnson as political opportunists, neither of whom would hesitate to trim sail in an adverse wind. He didn't believe that either Truman or Johnson understood the realities of the world conflict. He had dedicated himself to trying to increase this country's armed force; he had defied the pressure groups, and he felt, quite correctly, that Truman and Johnson would yield to the pressure groups and actually decrease the country's armed force.

This, of course, is exactly what Truman and Johnson did—once Forrestal was destroyed—and this is the essence of the Forrestal tragedy.

The conflict raged through January, February, and March, for by the middle of January, Forrestal's friends had begun fighting back. They spent \$35,000 trying to counteract the Winchell-Pearson campaign.

Forrestal's friends also tried to divide the pressure groups. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People had been brought in against Forrestal, with Walter White charging that the Defense Secretary had "delayed the end of segregation in the Armed Forces." To counteract this, the Urban League, another organization aiding the cause of Negroes, came vigorously to Forrestal's defense. The Urban League had assisted Forrestal in combatting communism among Negroes on our ships.

Responsible publishers tried to come to Forrestal's aid. Eugene Meyer dropped

Pearson's anti-Forrestal columns from the Washington Post.

Because Forrestal had been reared in a Catholic home, then had drifted away from the church and married a divorcee, he was attacked as a "renegade Catholic." The office of Cardinal Spellman, which perhaps had not been entirely unaware of Forrestal's effective efforts in Europe, rallied to his defense. To show that the church backed Forrestal, it was first planned to award him an honorary degree at Fordham, but this couldn't be done until May, and Forrestal needed help in March. So it was hastily arranged for him to address the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in New York on St. Patrick's Day.

At the St. Patrick's Day dinner, Cardinal Spellman, lauding Forrestal, went to the unusual extent of endorsing universal military training. If the Defense Secretary, the Cardinal said in effect, believes that this measure is necessary in this grave hour, then he has my support.

Forrestal's address was a sad affair, for after 10 weeks of such buffeting he was a fading man. Truman had demanded his resignation within 48 hours. He wanted the resignation to be as of April 1, but he wanted it in hand within 48 hours. Forrestal's first decision was to state his case in a long letter and release it to the press, and he asked his advisers in New York to prepare such a letter. Then he changed his mind and dictated his own brief resignation.

During March, Forrestal appeared dazed and depressed. His friends thought he might have been drugged. He talked sadly about how America was going the way of France; he predicted that American troops would be fighting within a year.

He showed interest when friends discussed with him the proposed purchase of the New York Sun. It was their plan to make him editor of the Sun so that he could continue his fight to arm America against the Soviet threat. When he went to Florida it was with the understanding that he would become editor of the Sun after his recuperation.

On April 1st Forrestal attended the mammoth swearing-in ceremonies of Johnson. He wept openly. The President insisted on decorating him—and Forrestal wept while the President was pinning on the medal, for he considered the gesture an insult. He walked back with Admiral Denfeld, weeping, and he told the Admiral that he was going down to Florida to play some golf.

On April 5th, there was a telephone call from Ferdinand Eberstadt in Washington to Robert A. Lovett in Hobe Sound, Fla. Mr. Eberstadt reported that Forrestal was ill.

"Is he very ill?" Mr. Lovett inquired.

"He is very, very ill," Mr. Eberstadt replied.

Four hours later, just at dusk, the big Air Force Constellation, the Dew Drop, circled and landed at a small, deserted field near Hobe Sound. Waiting was a single automobile in which were Mr. and Mrs. Lovett and Mrs. Forrestal. The door of the airplane was opened, the small ladder dropped.

"I looked up there and saw him standing in the door," Mr. Lovett recalls, "and he looked so pitiful. He was alone. And he didn't look like the man I had known at all. He looked like a little, old Irishman. He eyes were sunk, and I couldn't see his upper lip. As he came stumbling down that ladder I reached up and caught him under the arms."

After he had greeted the two women, Forrestal stood under the tail of the airplane and told Mr. Lovett that "they" had gotten him, that he was being followed, that his telephones were tapped, and he broke into tears as he said: "They're going to catch us unprepared, Bob; America is going the way of France."

During the evening he was quiet, but next day he was worse. Mr. Lovett telephoned Washington and Forrestal's personal attor-

ney, John Cahill, of New York, arrived with Dr. William Menninger and Dr. George Raines. The illness was diagnosed as occupational fatigue, and Forrestal was returned to Bethesda Naval Hospital.

Just what happened during the 7 weeks Forrestal was at Bethesda may never be known, but here are a few of the strange, human, and tragic developments.

Forrestal, in his sixteenth-floor suite, spent most of his time entirely alone. Mrs. Forrestal sailed for Europe on April 12.

Two of the persons who visited the hospital and who were most interested in Forrestal were his older brother, Henry Forrestal, of Beacon, N. Y., and Msgr. Maurice S. Sheehy, of Catholic University, Washington. Henry Forrestal lives at the Forrestal home place and is a highly respected citizen. Father Sheehy, a Navy chaplain, was one of Jim Forrestal's closest friends.

Early in 1949, Forrestal had asked Father Sheehy, along with Henry Forrestal, to help him return to the Catholic Church. To facilitate this return, some investigation had to be made into Mrs. Forrestal's previous divorce and this investigation was conducted by Henry Forrestal.

Forrestal was admitted to the hospital by Capt. B. W. Hogan, and Captain Hogan noted that Forrestal insisted on being listed as a Catholic. His first request was to see Father Sheehy. This request was noted by Captain Hogan, but for reasons not yet explained, Captain Raines, the psychiatrist in charge, refused this request.

On April 12, Henry Forrestal visited the hospital and talked with his brother as well as with Captains Hogan and Raines.

"Jim looked much better than I expected," Henry Forrestal recalls. "His eyes seemed clear; he was sharp and incisive. He told me: 'I'll be all right. We'll pull out of this.'"

What worried Henry Forrestal was the confinement in Bethesda. He told Captains Hogan and Raines: "What my brother needs is not to be cooped up there on the sixteenth floor. He needs to be on an estate somewhere, among friends, where he can walk around in the sun. He has been an exceedingly active man."

Mr. Forrestal asked Captain Raines: "Is my brother fundamentally okay?" Captain Raines answered: "Yes."

Henry Forrestal also told the doctors that his brother wished to talk with Father Sheehy. Captain Hogan replied, according to Mr. Forrestal: "Yes; he has asked to see the father several times. And, of course, he will."

On May 10, 11, and 12, Henry Forrestal again visited the hospital. Meanwhile, Father Sheehy had visited the hospital six times, each time asking to be allowed to see Forrestal and each time being denied permission by Captain Raines.

Henry Forrestal confronted Captain Raines and requested an explanation. Captain Raines, according to Mr. Forrestal, admitted that Forrestal had asked to see the priest. But Captain Raines wanted the priest to wait.

"How long do you want to wait, Doctor?" Mr. Forrestal asked. "We have waited 5 weeks. Delays in such cases can be dangerous. Have you ever heard of a case where being visited by a clergyman has hurt a man?"

Father Sheehy, who is built along the lines of a Notre Dame fullback, is no man to be put off easily. After arguments with Captain Raines, Father Sheehy got the impression that Raines was under some sort of orders in the case, so he went to John L. Sullivan, Secretary of the Navy. Sullivan called Dr. Raines and was assured that Father Sheehy could see the patient "in time."

Henry Forrestal was also determined to obtain his brother's release from Bethesda. He felt that if he could get Forrestal out in

the sun, on some estate, and allow Father Sheehy to talk with him, that he would recover quickly.

Father Sheehy, in opposing Dr. Raines, recalled statements by Dr. Jung to the effect that "out of hundreds of patients there was not one whose problem in the last resort was not that of finding a religious outlook on life." And again, "No patient has been really healed who did not regain his religious outlook."

For Sunday, May 22, Henry Forrestal had a travel reservation to Washington. He was going to make another effort to obtain his brother's release from Bethesda.

But it was too late. At 1:45 a. m. on Sunday, May 22, Jim Forrestal escaped from his sixteenth-floor prison to his death.

When he was buried in Arlington, Truman declared: "This great American was as truly a casualty of the war as if he had died on the firing line."

Father Sheehy declares: "Had I been allowed to see my friend, Jim Forrestal, receive him back in the church, and put his mind at ease with the oldest and most reliable medicine known to mankind, he would be alive today. His blood is on the heads of those who kept me from seeing him."

Dr. Raines has nothing to say, although a formal demand has been made on the Navy by members of Congress for an explanation as to why Forrestal was denied the comfort of his friend and spiritual adviser.

Meanwhile, the people of the United States have paid in blood for the political opportunism which destroyed Forrestal. In a few years perhaps a monument may be erected to him, and a suitable inscription might be:

"Here lies a patriot who also possessed vision. In a period of crisis for his Nation, when mediocrity was enthroned in Washington, he stood forth as a first-rate mind, a dedicated spirit, an inspiring Renaissance man who understood the realities of the world in which he lived, and who, scorning opportunism, gave his energy, his mind, and his life."

WILLIAM BRADFORD HUIE.

Mr. McCARTHY. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD in a two-page statement made by the very able junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on November 2, 1950.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The shocking attempt to assassinate the President emphasizes the seriousness of the Communist menace within the United States.

It is the bitter fruit of the years of appeasement and coddling communism in and out of the Federal Government and makes mandatory swift separation of all subversives from Government employment. The tragic event at Blair House emphasizes the urgency for rigid enforcement of the newly passed anti-Communist law and an end to efforts of those in charge of administering the law to discredit it.

The American people want the Mundt-Nixon-McCarthy antisubversive law enforced by officials who are sympathetic to its purposes.

The Blair House tragedy furnishes ample evidence that there must be action. The American people are demanding firm action to protect the country against the Communist fifth column which becomes bolder and bolder every day.

Announcement by the President in his radio address next Saturday night that he has ordered all law-enforcement agencies to enforce firmly the provisions of the Mundt-Nixon-McCarthy anti-Communist law will be reassuring to the people in their thankfulness that the President's life has been saved.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover stated to the members of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, of which I am a member, that the number of Communists in the United States has increased to over 50,000 in recent years and they have 500,000 fellow travelers.

The President should immediately order Attorney General McGrath to have every Communist leader arrested for failure to register, as is provided in the antisubversive law, and prosecuted for failure to register, as is provided therein.

All State Governors and municipal police officers no doubt will gladly cooperate.

If President Truman will now give the order to J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, he will soon round up the dangerous Communists—he will get the job done.

The Blair House tragedy is a grim warning of what can happen in the United States. Action now will speak louder than words.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, again the junior Senator from Nebraska showed his great ability as a leader. Again he has hit the nail on the head. And now I ask President Truman:

With the Communist hordes massing our boys in Korea and the whole world trembling on the brink of a war to extinction, have you had enough, Mr. President? Will you act before it is too late, or are your hands so firmly tied by the Red masters of your administration that you cannot do what the junior Senator from Nebraska and other patriotic Americans are demanding?

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "The Case Against Dean Acheson," written by Victor Lasky. Victor Lasky is the co-author of the Seeds of Treason.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE CASE AGAINST DEAN ACHESON

(By Victor Lasky)

When Arthur Bliss Lane, former Ambassador to Poland, learned of Dean Acheson's appointment as Secretary of State, he blurted out, "God help the United States."

It was no secret, although Mr. Lane refused to discuss the matter with the press, that his perhaps undiplomatic outburst was occasioned by his bitter experience trying to block a \$90,000,000 postwar loan to the Soviet-controlled Warsaw regime.

Appealing to the State Department to refuse the loan, Mr. Lane had pointed to the Red terror in Poland, the arrests of American citizens, and the crushing of all freedoms. He added: "With the greatest earnestness of which I am capable, I beg the Department not to approve the extension of any credits at this time."

Nevertheless, the loan was granted with the approval of Dean Acheson, then Under Secretary of State. It had been negotiated by Donald Hiss, brother of Alger and a member of Mr. Acheson's law firm.

As it turned out, Mr. Lane was right. The loan was used to strengthen Soviet control of Poland.

In approving it Mr. Acheson could at the very least be accused of bad judgment. But there have been many such cases, too many to be explained as mere coincidences. Taken together they constitute a pattern of behavior on Mr. Acheson's part which can only be described as serving the interests of the Soviet Union.

Lest this be considered too harsh a judgment, let it be recalled that recently an official White House spokesman, W. Averell Harriman, could charge Senator ROBERT A. TAFT with actions which further the design of the Kremlin.

It would be absurd to accuse Mr. Acheson of membership in the Communist Party. It is not absurd, however, to say on the basis of his 9-year record in and out of the State Department that he has been incapable of fully understanding the nature of the Communist conspiracy to conquer the world.

And it has been an open conspiracy, spelled out to the 7th degree in the writings of Lenin and Stalin, in the resolutions of the Comintern, the Cominform, and various Communist Party congresses throughout the world.

Mr. Acheson seems to have awakened to a few facts of Soviet aggression and bad faith only in recent years. Yet the record was clear as far back as 1939 when Russia, in complicity with Hitler Germany, seized eastern Poland and the Baltic states. For its unprovoked aggression against Finland the expiring League of Nations expelled Russia from membership.

But even today Mr. Acheson has faith in the Soviet revolution, thinking perhaps it may get on the right track. Speaking before the United Nations Assembly, at the height of the Korean debate, Mr. Acheson said:

"This perspective takes into account the possibility that the Soviet Government may not be inherently and unalterably committed to standing in the way of peace, and that it may some day accept a live-and-let-live philosophy.

"The Soviet leaders are realists, in some respects at least. As we succeed in building the necessary economic and defensive military strength it will become clear to them that the non-Soviet world will neither collapse nor be dismembered piecemeal.

"Some modification in their aggressive policies may follow, if they then recognize that the best interests of the Soviet Union require a cooperative relationship with the outside world.

"Time may have its effect. It is but 33 years since the overthrow of the Tsarist regime in Russia. This is a short time in history. Like many other social and political movements before it, the Soviet revolution may change."

Even the Korean War, launched by a Kremlin signal, has failed to teach Mr. Acheson the facts of the Communist conspiracy. He reveals as the central point of his own ideology a studied indifference to the menace of Soviet dictatorship.

Mr. Acheson's continuing use of the unfortunate phrase, "the Soviet leaders," which presupposes they have a devoted following and are not cruel despots who rule with an iron hand—is perhaps revealing.

More revealing was his recent Freedom House speech in which he admitted that "a broad compromise" with the Soviet dictatorship was impossible—at this time. Mr. Acheson insisted that as America rearms and as America rearms Europe "negotiations become possible."

"As the strength and durability of the free nations bite into the consciousness of the Soviet leaders, some modification of their determination to achieve world domination could follow," he said.

"This would open the door on many possibilities for the peaceful adjustment of differences."

In other words, we can still do business with Stalin.

Mr. Acheson's myopia toward Stalinism has in large measure led American foreign policy to fail completely—to a point where the masters of the Kremlin now call the tune.

For the road to Korea is strewn with the wreckage of Mr. Acheson's miscalculations and blunders—the chief of which was the loss of China and its 400,000,000 people to the Soviet Union.

The incredible theory that the Chinese Reds were not real Reds but "agrarian reformers" was long the cornerstone of the Far East policy promulgated by the Acheson

clique. And, according to this group, the Chiang Kai-shek regime was riddled with such corruption it could not be saved. Mr. Acheson set up standards of purity which could not be found in the New York City police department much less in Kansas City.

Despite the fall of China and the Korean mess, Mr. Acheson is still unable to come up with an affirmative Far East policy. He clings to a bankrupt program involving the eventual recognition of Red China, the disparagement of Gen. Douglas MacArthur (his ancient enemy), the abandonment of Formosa and the sabotage of Chiang Kai-shek's valiant efforts to win back his country. As a result, outside of South Korea, we do not have one trustworthy ally in Asia.

Presumably, Mr. Acheson's Far East program is based on the gamble that China's Red leader, Mao Tse-tung, will become another Tito and a thorn in Stalin's side. For Mr. Acheson seems to have an inordinate trust in Tito's brand of communism.

Meanwhile, Mr. Acheson is fighting the loan to Spain proposed by the Senate. Though so tolerant of the Red regime in Warsaw, Mr. Acheson deprecates the totalitarian nature of the Franco regime.

This peculiar standard toward totalitarians extends to Yugoslavia. Mr. Acheson is more than willing to do business with Marshal Tito. Apparently the Tito police state is more palatable to Mr. Acheson than Franco's.

At the same time Mr. Acheson has constantly come to the defense of persons accused of being Communists, dupes of Communists or out-and-out Soviet agents. This penchant of Mr. Acheson's has led to widespread criticism and fear throughout the Nation that the State Department has become the haven of a Communist gang. And Mr. Acheson has done little to dispel that ever-spreading belief.

Instead he has repeatedly scoffed at such allegations. And he has constantly ignored warnings of Red infiltration of the Department. These warnings had come regularly from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and State Department security officials. At least one security officer was chastened for being "overzealous." That official, his pension at stake, took the hint and was forced into silence.

The security situation had become so frightful by June 1947 under Mr. Acheson's administration of the Department that a Senate appropriations subcommittee addressed a then secret memorandum to Gen. George C. Marshall, then Secretary of State. General Marshall, incidentally, did nothing about the matter.

"It becomes necessary due to the gravity of the situation to call your attention to a condition that developed and still flourishes in the State Department under the administration of Dean Acheson," the memorandum stated.

"It is evident that there is a deliberate, calculated program being carried out not only to protect Communist personnel in high places but to reduce security and intelligence protection to a nullity.

"On file in the Department is a copy of a preliminary report of the FBI on Soviet espionage activities in the United States, which involves a large number of State Department employees, some in high official positions. This report has been challenged and ignored by those charged with the responsibility of administering the Department with the apparent tacit approval of Mr. Acheson.

"Should this case break before the State Department acts, it will be a national disgrace. Voluminous files are on hand in the Department proving the connection of the State Department employees and officials of this Soviet espionage ring."

Yet at the height of the furor over Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY's charges against the State Department Mr. Acheson permitted

himself a flight of moral indignation before a group of newspaper editors.

Mr. Acheson accused the Wisconsin Republican of a "mad and vicious operation" in demanding the exposure of alleged Reds in the Department. Mr. Acheson insisted that his staff consisted of honorable, loyal, and clean living American men and women—presumably not including the 91 homosexuals fired by the State Department nor the several Department employees arrested on morals charges since.

Mr. Acheson's blanket clearance of all Department employees indicates clearly he is unable—or unwilling—to believe that the Soviet Union could plant agents or sympathizers in his Department. In July 1946 he told a congressional committee that many persons cited as security risks or loyalty suspects were affiliated with progressive organizations and that he would not fire progressives.

Many of these progressive organizations have since been listed by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist.

Not even a jury verdict based on a mountain of evidence was apparently enough to convince Mr. Acheson that Alger Hiss was a proven Soviet spy. As far back as 1940 or 1941 Adolf A. Berle, Jr., an Assistant Secretary of State, then in charge of the Department's security, warned Mr. Acheson about the Hiss brothers—Alger and Donald.

Mr. Berle has since recalled that Mr. Acheson "said he had known the family of these boys from childhood and would vouch for them absolutely." The record shows that Mr. Acheson permitted Alger Hiss to rise to important policy-making posts without apparently making any effort to resolve doubts as to his loyalty. And Mr. Acheson made Donald Hiss—his protegee—a member of his law firm, where he still is today.

In 1945 when the FBI arrested six persons on charges involving espionage, in what has become known as the Amerasia case, Mr. Acheson went to bat for one of the defendants, John Stewart Service. Mr. Service, a State Department career officer, has since admitted turning over secret Government documents to Philip Jaffe, a known Soviet agent.

When Senator McCARTHY revived the Service case, Mr. Service was called home from abroad for a new investigation by a loyalty board. Even before the board looked into the matter, Mr. Acheson cleared Service. He authorized a statement calling the McCarthy charges "dead, discredited, and disproven." The statement said "the sympathy and good wishes of the entire Department go out" to Mr. Service and his family. No one was very much surprised, therefore, when the loyalty board again cleared Mr. Service.

Despite his arrest, Mr. Service has won consistent promotions in the State Department. Compare this with the treatment accorded Angus Ward, a courageous diplomat of the old school who was detained for 13 months by the Chinese Reds in Mukden. Mr. Ward, who never made any secret of his detestation of the be-nice-to-Russia crowd among his colleagues, was finally rewarded with an obscure consular post in British East Africa.

Apparently Mr. Acheson can't forget or forgive Mr. Ward for snarling up his plan of recognizing Red China last year by getting himself arrested.

Another to whose defense Mr. Acheson rushed was Lauchlin Currie, one of the late President Roosevelt's "anonymous" advisers. Mr. Currie was named as a fellow traveler by both Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers.

Mr. Currie appeared before the House Un-American Activities Committee to deny the charges. Mr. Acheson acted as his counsel. Mr. Currie today continues to have State Department backing in his various ventures.

The Secretary also came to the aid of Harold Glasser, another accused by Miss

Bentley. Mr. Glasser had been a technical adviser for Mr. Acheson at the founding meeting of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Despite the charges, Mr. Acheson wrote a letter of recommendation which Mr. Glasser used to obtain an important post in a New York charities organization.

Both Hiss brothers continue to hold his friendship which, as Mr. Acheson told a Senate Committee looking into his fitness to serve as Secretary, "is not easily given and is not easily withdrawn."

But what unsettled Congress completely was Mr. Acheson's proclamation that he would not "turn his back" on Alger Hiss, even after Hiss was convicted by a jury of his peers.

Enlightened lawmakers who would concede Mr. Acheson the human privilege of standing by a friend felt he could not disassociate himself from his official position in commenting at all. Even Senator Scott Lucas, the Democratic whip, publicly repudiated the Acheson declaration. He said it wasn't doing the party much good.

Although Mr. Acheson would not "turn his back" on a convicted traitor, he seems to have turned his back on the victims of communism—the hundreds of Americans who are being held against their will behind the iron curtain.

One of them is Robert A. Vogeler, the American businessman sentenced to 15 years in Hungary in a mock trial. According to Mrs. Vogeler, who saw Mr. Acheson to protest American indifference to her husband's fate, the Secretary spoke of "patience and fortitude" and asked her to forget a plan she had for rescue and to keep mum.

"I received nothing but empty promises," she bitterly complained to newspapermen.

Mr. Acheson's role in the case of Dr. Karl von Kleeckowski is perhaps significant. Dr. von Kleeckowski and his wife had been recruited in the Balkans for United States counterespionage by Gov. George H. Earle, of Pennsylvania, when he was President Roosevelt's wartime undercover representative.

For their work Governor Earle promised them asylum in the United States. But, when they arrived here aboard a United States Army plane, they were seized and interned as enemy aliens.

Governor Earle immediately launched a campaign in their behalf, charging that Communist influences in the State Department sought their deportation. Mr. Acheson accused them of being "dangerous enemy aliens."

Their attorney, Louis Waldman, demanded a bill of particulars which Mr. Acheson never furnished. Mr. Waldman said that perhaps their anti-Red reports on the Balkan situation had led to Mr. Acheson's antagonism. Eventually, they were deported to South America.

Also arousing considerable feelings in Congress has been the activities of Mr. Acheson's law firm, Covington, Burling, Rublee & Shorb.

In January 1947, Representative PAUL W. SHAFER accused Mr. Acheson of profiting from business the firm had obtained from foreign governments. He cited the Polish loan as an example.

"Along with the other great financial wizards of the New Deal," Mr. SHAFER charged, "Mr. Acheson has learned well how to feather his own nest while serving in a public post." Mr. Acheson denied the charge.

The firm got into the news again last February when it was disclosed that Mr. Acheson's former partner, Charles A. Horsky, was circulating a petition demanding as "imperative in the public interest" a public investigation of the "lawless conduct of the FBI."

Mr. Horsky accused the FBI of illegal wire tapping, rifling private mail, destroying evidence, and counseling false and misleading sworn testimony by FBI agents.

Although the Communist Party had launched its own anti-FBI campaign, Mr. Horsky said he abhorred communism. There is nothing in the record to indicate how Mr. Acheson felt about Mr. Horsky's crusade. But soon after its disclosure it was quietly stifled.

In August 1949, Mr. Acheson scoffed at charges that the United Nations had permitted large numbers of Soviet agents to pour into the United States in the guise of UN officials. Senator PAT MCCARRAN, a Democrat, said he had the facts to back up such charges.

A half year later Senator MCCARRAN was proved right in one significant case. The FBI arrested a Russian national, Valentin Gubitchev, an employee of the United Nations, along with Judith Coplon, a Justice Department employee, on espionage charges. Both were convicted.

But Gubitchev was allowed to return to his homeland by Mr. Acheson, despite the fact Americans were being held in Red dungeons. Presumably Gubitchev's release was effected in order to obtain the release of someone like Mr. Vogeler. But if there was a quid pro quo arrangement it never came off—at least publicly.

Events have shown that Mr. Acheson's policies have at the very least been stupid. But he is still in charge of making foreign policy during the worst crisis this Nation has ever faced. And he has remained possibly because of Mr. Truman's own inability to realize that Josef Stalin—"good old Joe," he once called him—cannot be dealt with like the boys in Kansas City.

It is this soft-headed unrealistic thinking about world affairs which has led this Nation to the shadow of catastrophe.

Mr. Acheson is not a trained diplomat. He never saw foreign duty in the State Department. He entered Government service in the early thirties as an Under Secretary of the Treasury. President Roosevelt fired him after calling him a lightweight. Mr. Acheson had opposed tinkering with the dollar.

But it would be wrong to assume that Mr. Acheson was a man with set principles. For he eventually reappeared on the scene as an ardent New Dealer. In 1941, having obtained F. D. R.'s forgiveness, Mr. Acheson entered the State Department.

Before long he took over the leadership of a large intellectual fellowship in the Department which was morally certain that eternal peace lay entirely in a sympathetic understanding of Russia. Mr. Acheson and his soulmates, including Alger Hiss, saw everything that transpired in the Soviet Union as good, or, in the light of history, forgivable.

Adolf A. Berle, who is no reactionary, has testified how this fellowship gained the ascendancy in the Department. Mr. Berle declared under oath that in the fall of 1944 "there was a difference of opinion" in the Department.

"I felt that the Russians were not going to be sympathetic and cooperative," Mr. Berle said. "Victory was then assured, but not complete, and the intelligence reports indicated a very aggressive policy, not at all in line with the kind of cooperation everyone was hoping for.

"I was pressing for a pretty clean-cut show-down when our position was strongest. The opposite group in the State Department was largely the men—Mr. Acheson's group, of course—with Mr. Hiss as a principal assistant in the matter. I got trimmed in that fight and, as a result, went to Brazil and that ended by diplomatic career."

Other experienced diplomats got "trimmed" in that fight. Most notable was Joseph C. Grew, our former Ambassador to Japan, who resigned in August 1945 as Under Secretary to be succeeded by Mr. Acheson.

The shift proved great cause for joy at Communist Party headquarters. The Daily

Worker declared that Mr. Grew's resignation meant that "the forces in the State Department which were relatively anti-imperialist were strengthened." The Communist Party had already praised the new Under Secretary "as one of the most forward-looking men in the State Department." On October 7, 1945, the pro-Soviet newspaper, PM, now defunct, declared: "Now State Department policy has a better appreciation of what the Soviet Union wants."

Possibly the left-wing newspapers had recalled the role played by Mr. Acheson at the founding meeting of UNRRA in 1943. How UNRRA, its staff heavily infiltrated by Stalinists, became a tool of Soviet conquest, is a story never adequately told.

For the scandals involving the misuse of UNRRA supplies could not be properly investigated by Congress, thanks in large measure to Mr. Acheson, even though the United States footed most of the tremendous bill.

Mr. Acheson had approved a decision to permit the recipient governments to distribute supplies without proper checking as to what became of them. This was a set-up proposed by the Russians. According to the former Polish Ambassador, Jan Ciechenowski, in his book, *Defeat in Victory*, Mr. Acheson not only approved it but forced the British to accept.

Thus, when the American Legion protested against further UNRRA aid to Tito, after American planes were shot down over Yugoslavia, Mr. Acheson declared that the United States had no authority to withhold supplies. And never once has Mr. Acheson mentioned the proved fact that Russia had abused UNRRA aid for her own political purposes.

And only last August, Mr. Acheson, kowtowing again to Marshal Tito's police state, saw to it that no official United States representative attended the unveiling in Arlington Cemetery of a headstone for the five young American fliers shot down over Yugoslavia.

Arthur Bliss Lane, who had warned against the Polish loan, had raised the money for the headstone in private subscriptions. Columnist Ernest Lindley, who disclosed the story, concluded: "Diplomatic delicacy has its values but it should not be permitted to interfere with official homage to the dead."

Soon after succeeding Mr. Grew, Mr. Acheson seemed to go out of his way to earn the Daily Worker's accolades. He set about putting Gen. Douglas MacArthur in his place. The general, then under heavy fire from the Russians in Tokyo, had stated that Japan was docile enough to be occupied by only 200,000 troops.

This did not set too well with the Far East Section of the State Department, whose guiding spirit was Owen Lattimore, and which sought a great social and economic revolution in Japan. Their schemes would require large numbers of troops to back the "social revolution."

In a statement described by the Associated Press as "more pugnacious than diplomatic," Mr. Acheson reminded General MacArthur that the State Department, and not he, "is determining American policy toward Japan."

For this, PM said, "Hats off to Dean Acheson \* \* \* the leader of the younger, more progressive men in the State Department \* \* \* who won the first round in his fight for a stern, but just, Japanese peace."

Mr. Acheson has testified that one reason he rebuked General MacArthur was that he felt the need for a liberal government in Japan—a government in whose administration the Soviet Union would have a part. At the time it was Mr. Acheson's view that the participation of the Soviet regime makes a government liberal.

In the long run, General MacArthur, of course, was proved right; but this hasn't kept

Mr. Acheson from continuing a bitter feud with the general to this day. That the feud is recognized by the White House is indicated by the fact that President Truman did not take Mr. Acheson with him on his recent Wake Island junket, where he met the general for the first time.

There is nothing in the record to indicate that Mr. Acheson had ever sought General MacArthur's advice, even though he probably is one of the leading American experts on Far East questions.

Yet the State Department has been responsible for a variety of peculiar orders to the general, the most curious of which was the order, still in effect, certifying the Japanese Communist Party as one of the democratic groups to receive official encouragement.

Mr. Acheson, who played a key role in the making of foreign policy in the past decade, is no expert on the inner politics of international relations. Writing in the May 1946 issue of the *American Mercury*, Benjamin Stolberg, an astute journalist, recognized this fact.

"And so," added Mr. Stolberg, "our Under Secretary is constantly wetting his finger to see which way the winds are blowing. Naturally, he is wetting his finger in the atmosphere in which he moves, and that atmosphere is one of confused liberalism and Soviet friendship in the romantic sense.

"The truth is that he is not an astute and fundamental observer; his brilliance is professional, reckless, and on the surface. Nor is he a strong personality; he is sensitive to the pseudo-liberal opinions of PM, the Nation, and the New Republic, of the fashionably leftish journalists, commentators, bureaucrats, professors, and movie stars. As Under Secretary of State, he has been constantly under the influence and pressure of these waves of opinion, set in motion and manipulated by an invisible force."

A classic example of how the Acheson clique operated—how a small group fostered policies contrary to American interests, but amenable to the left—can be seen in our postwar policies toward Japan.

Prior to the Japanese surrender, the Far East subcommittee of the State-War-Navy Departments' coordinating committee was charged with preparing a statement of general initial policy relating to Japan. Mr. Acheson attended the meetings. Others from State who sat in included Joseph C. Grew; his able assistant, Eugene Dooman, and Joseph Ballantine, the director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs—all with lengthy experience in Tokyo.

These career officers felt certain that the Japanese would never surrender unless the position of the Emperor was recognized. They felt that Japan would be ungovernable if the Imperial authority was destroyed.

Although such views, at the height of a bitter war, could not be expected to have had any popular appeal, events since have demonstrated they were correct. But Mr. Acheson opposed them. And a bitter fight, the leftist side of which carried over into certain newspapers, raged in the Department—climaxed by the resignations of Messrs. Grew, Dooman, and Ballantine.

In their stead came Owen Lattimore, deputy director of the Office of War Information; John Carter Vincent, chief of the State Department's China section; and Lauchlin Currie, then with the Office of Economic Warfare.

Generally the new group advocated measures proposed in Mr. Lattimore's *Solution in Asia*, a copy of which was seen on Mr. Truman's desk when the President announced the Japanese surrender. Mr. Lattimore had urged the abolition of the Japanese monarchy, banishment of the Imperial family to China for life, dissolution of large Japanese enterprises and a purge of business executives.

The new leftist State Department crowd came up with a program which in effect called for the atomizing of Japanese industry into single-plant companies; taking securities from their owners for a purely nominal price; and selling them to new entrepreneurs—such as farmers' cooperatives and labor unions, many of them Communist-controlled.

But the Acheson-Lattimore-Vincent group could not sell its views on the Japanese monarchy even though, according to Drew Pearson, Mr. Acheson had arranged for Mr. Lattimore to talk to Mr. Truman on the matter. Later, Mr. Truman appointed Mr. Lattimore as a member of the Pauley reparations commission to Tokyo.

The Acheson-Lattimore-Vincent program for Japan proved unworkable and within 3 years, at the insistence of the late James V. Forrestal, it was reversed. Today the same general standards apply to Japanese business as apply to American corporations under the antitrust laws.

In November 1945, Mr. Acheson went out of his way to demonstrate his sympathetic understanding of Russia by appearing at a Madison Square Garden rally called by the National Conference of Soviet-American Friendship.

Other speakers at the rally, called to welcome the Dean of Canterbury, the Red eccentric of the Church of England, included Corliss Lamont, Paul Robeson, Albert Fitzgerald, and Joseph E. Davis.

By this time Soviet intentions in the post-war world had become unmistakable even for the most woollyheaded. But Mr. Acheson told an assembled throng of Communists and fellow travelers that "there is no specific reason to suppose" that "the vital interests of the American and Russian people" will ever clash.

"We understand," continued Mr. Acheson, "and agree with them to have friendly governments along her borders is essential, both for the security of the Soviet Union and for the peace of the world."

This could only be read to mean that the United States would oppose unfriendly—i. e., anti-Communist—governments along her borders. The record shows clearly that, except for empty protests to placate American opinion, the State Department acquiesced in the formation of Red satellites in eastern Europe. Such was Acheson policy.

The same fuzzy-minded regard for the Kremlin's susceptibilities was demonstrated by Mr. Acheson when he and David Lillenthal prepared a report on atomic energy. Dated March 28, 1946, the report looked forward to giving the atomic secret to Russia. The report declared:

"When the plan is in full operation there will no longer be secrets about atomic energy. We believe that this is the firmest basis of security; for, in the long term there can be no international control and no international cooperation which does not presuppose international community of knowledge." Fortunately, Bernard M. Baruch's commission took a more realistic view of our peace-loving Soviet allies. The Baruch plan provided for continuing inspection, free of the veto. Russia, of course, refused.

In May 1946 as Acting Secretary, Mr. Acheson announced that Soviet representatives would be permitted to witness the atomic tests at Bikini. This was an offer of cooperation the Russians did not turn down.

In September 1945, Mr. Acheson—constantly worried about the Kremlin's susceptibilities—prevented the House Un-American Activities Committee from holding public hearings in the case of Sam Carp, a brother-in-law of Soviet Foreign Minister Vyacheslav Molotov.

Mr. Carp, a Bridgeport, Conn., businessman, had been called to explain some of his business relations with the Soviet Union. Mr. Acheson, in his request to the con-

gressional group, said such testimony might embarrass United States-Soviet relations.

It was in this period that Mr. Acheson, as Acting Secretary, broke off United States diplomatic relations with Spain. At the request of Freda Kirchwey, editor of the Nation, he received Dr. Juan Negrin, who headed the pro-Soviet wing of the Spanish Republican forces. But he refused to see cabinet members of the Spanish Government in exile who, though Socialists, were opposed to Moscow.

For some reason Mr. Acheson has an aversion toward anti-Communist Socialists. Norman Thomas has repeatedly tried to see him to give information on Socialist politics abroad—where they are of considerable importance. Yet, Mr. Acheson has been too busy to see Mr. Thomas.

On December 20, 1945, Mr. Acheson was not too busy to receive Milton Wolff, head of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade which recruited Americans to fight illegally in the Spanish Civil War. The following day the Daily Worker reported that Mr. Acheson had promised to intervene with Franco in behalf of two brigade members held in Spain.

In March 1946, Mr. Acheson snubbed Winston Churchill after the former British Prime Minister delivered his now famous Fulton, Mo., speech warning the world against the Soviet threat. Although Mr. Truman had sat on the dais when Mr. Churchill delivered his speech, Mr. Acheson's attitude was plainly shown when he refused to appear at a New York dinner welcoming Mr. Churchill. The Churchill speech had been bitterly assailed by the Communists, following Moscow's lead. It was at this time that Mr. Acheson was supposed to have discarded his pro-Soviet orientation. Why this should have been Mr. Acheson's turning point nobody knows. There is, however, the curious coincidence that the Russians were then threatening the Middle East oil fields. Mr. Acheson's law firm had long represented an important oil firm.

However, Mr. Acheson's supposed change of heart became known when he pledged American intervention in the event Iran was attacked by Russia.

However, Mr. Acheson was not too happy over the Truman doctrine which had been announced by the President in March 1947. The doctrine permitted the United States to intervene in the affairs of any nation threatened by Soviet aggression.

As the first step, Mr. Truman recommended military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey. Economic aid, under the doctrine, was to be strictly limited to the main purpose—opposing the spread of Soviet power with arms, if necessary.

On May 10, 1947, Mr. Acheson, according to the United Press, took the lead to shift the emphasis in the Truman doctrine from an ideological crusade against communism to an economic program for rebuilding western Europe and the Far East into healthy, democratic areas.

At the same time, over bitter congressional opposition, Mr. Acheson insisted that the United States deliver nearly \$17,000,000 worth of postwar lend-lease supplies to Russia. Several Congressmen pointed out the inconsistency in sending such equipment while carrying out the Truman doctrine. But Mr. Acheson said the United States must abide by its contracts. Senator STYLES BRIGES thereupon accused Mr. Acheson of talking tough out of one corner of his mouth while advocating aid to Russia out of the other.

Mr. Acheson then made several speeches expressing the need for rebuilding the economies of western Europe. This was followed by Gen. George C. Marshall's speech at Harvard which led to the Marshall plan. Mr. Acheson has since taken credit as the brains behind the Marshall plan. And this has been constantly cited to prove how anti-Communist Mr. Acheson is.

Actually, the plan as originally worked out by Mr. Acheson contemplated enormous gifts

to Russia and the east European satellites. In fact, the Red regime in Prague had originally endorsed the plan. But the Prague Communists were forced to swallow the endorsement when the Kremlin decided the Marshall plan was a Wall Street plot.

When Russia refused to play ball, the plan was proclaimed as a certain means of placing western Europe in a position to defend herself against Russia. But as it worked out, it did nothing of the sort. In effect, the plan constituted an abandonment of the Truman doctrine. The Economic Cooperation Administration sought the economic recovery of the world, but without military protection for nations in the Soviet line of march.

And ECA has encouraged Europeans to believe they have a right to a high standard of living without doing anything in their own behalf either to achieve it or to protect it against Moscow.

As a result, despite all the billions spent by the ECA, not a single new division of fighting men has been created in Soviet-menaced Europe to resist aggression. Yet the Marshall plan has been sold to the American people as having stopped communism.

But, as Representative WALTER JUDT has asked, "Why should we expect the Communists to keep out of western Europe when our investment of billions only makes those countries more tempting?"

The answer to Mr. Judd's question can be found in Korea, a nation to which we provided some economic aid but no military support.

As yet, Mr. Acheson refuses to admit that the debacle in China was a major defeat for American foreign policy. Our goal was, or should have been, the promotion of a free, friendly and democratic China. Instead, we are confronted with a China, which was never less free, less friendly, and farther from democracy.

And Mr. Acheson is still continuing his suicidal feud with Chiang Kai-shek, the still-recognized head of a friendly anti-Communist foreign power. As recently as last July 30, Mr. Acheson was quoted as declaring:

"The idea is loose in our country that we are all-powerful and can dictate world affairs. That assumption leads to the belief that, whenever something goes wrong, some American official must be at fault.

"The Red capture of China was so regarded by many. Actually, China's fall was solely the fault of Chiang Kai-shek; he refused all friendly advice, lost every vestige of his popular support, and was ultimately taken to the Communist cleaners."

In one breath, Mr. Acheson states grandly that we cannot "dictate world affairs" and, in the next, he berates Chiang for refusing "all friendly advice," presumably American demands he make his peace with the Reds and clean out "corruption."

Mr. Acheson is quick to discover corruption in governments pledged to fight communism. Last January he accused the Philippine Government of misusing American funds. The speech came when Communist-led Hukapalahaps roamed the countryside spreading death and destruction.

The official Philippines' reactions were interesting. Declared President Elpidio Quirino: "I deplore the insinuation that the Philippines may be a second China."

Finance Secretary Pio Pedrosa lashed back with the accusation that any misuse of funds was the fault of Americans who participated in graft in the disposition of surplus property.

"I will not be surprised," said Mr. Pedrosa, "if, sensing that the Philippines might be lost to democracy because of fast developments in Communist Asia, the United States State Department may not be preparing to ease the United States gracefully out of the picture by issuing a white paper on the Philippines—the first inklings should be the supposed misuse of this \$2,000,000 aid."

Mr. Acheson has played an extremely important role in the shaping of United States

policies in the Far East. In the fall of 1945 he and his Director of Far Eastern Affairs, John Carter Vincent, wrote the instructions and the President's statement which sent Gen. George C. Marshall to China on his ill-fated mission.

The first draft of the President's statement asserted that the United States would do no business with Chiang, unless he made a deal with the Communists by taking them into his government. Only when the War Department protested was the statement watered down to read that the United States would support the Nationalist Government "so long as it moves toward peace and unity."

For the War Department well knew, through its own intelligence sources, the real nature of Chinese Communists and their complete control by Moscow. But its G-2 reports were discounted by the "wiser heads" in the State Department. And not one of them appears in Mr. Acheson's white paper on China.

Presumably Mr. Acheson now knows well the fate of the coalition-with-Communists policy in Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia. Yet, despite the lessons of eastern Europe, Mr. Acheson has constantly denounced Chiang for refusing to have anything to do with Soviet agents.

For that refusal the Republic of China was punished. From 1946 to 1948 the State Department clamped down on aid to the Nationalists. On March 20, 1947, Mr. Acheson, arguing against aid to China, told Congress:

"The Chinese Government is not in the position at the present time that the Greek Government is in. It is not approaching collapse. It is not threatened by defeat by the Communists. The war with the Communists is going on much as it has for the last 20 years."

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union was sending a steady stream of arms to the Chinese "agrarian reformers"—and their counterparts in North Korea. Finally, when the war-weary Chinese Government forces were cracking up under the strain of new onslaughts by the freshly armed Red troops, the United States began sending a trickle of counterbalancing supplies.

But this was not the picture painted in the white paper on China released by the State Department on August 5, 1949, with a statement that it was salient and frank.

The New York Times thought otherwise. An editorial on the white paper declared:

"It is not unfair to point out that such a summary cannot possibly be objective. The Department will not inform the President that this effort over which it has labored is inadequate or misleading. It will not take the position that the policies it has shaped have been mistaken. This inquest on China is not the work of a serene and detached coroner but of a vitally interested party in the catastrophe. Unfortunately, at this point, one of these vital interests is self-justification, which certainly is the enemy of objective analyses."

In his letter of transmittal to the President, Mr. Acheson asked the American people to accept the proposition that the terrible failure of United States policy in China was not the responsibility of United States diplomacy. The self-serving document reached the astonishing conclusion that nothing the State Department did or did not do contributed to the ominous result.

The plain truth is that the white paper is merely the wrapping for a black record of failure. It is a masterpiece of omissions, evasions, tricky half-truths, sly slants and twists to create misleading impressions and to conceal grave misjudgments. Its publication marked the lowest point ever reached by American diplomacy; the nearest thing to political bankruptcy a great power can acknowledge.

The editor, selected by Mr. Acheson, was Prof. Philip C. Jessup, whose main qualifica-

tion for the job apparently was his long association with the American Institute of Pacific Relations. An expert on international law, Professor Jessup had no direct experience in the Far East.

The IPR was the chief instrument used by the Communist Party to conduct a vigorous propaganda campaign aimed at discrediting the Republic of China. For many years Dr. Jessup's close friend, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, the millionaire Communist, was the institute's executive director and financial angel. Under Dr. Jessup's direction the institute's publication published many pro-Communist articles. A. T. S. Bisson article, referring to the two Chinas, declared:

"One is now generally called Kuomintang China, the other is called Communist China. However, these are only party labels. To be more descriptive, the one might be called feudal China, the other democratic China."

Dr. Jessup, listed as a sponsor of several Communist fronts, was also a friend of Alger Hiss and, in fact, appeared as a character witness for Hiss at his perjury trial. Perhaps this stood him in good stead with Mr. Acheson, who has used the professor on many vital assignments, the most important of which was the editing of the white paper. By its publication:

1. Mr. Acheson committed an impulsive act against a fully recognized government of a great power, a fact which undoubtedly made every other government wonder if it must conform to our every recommendation on pain of being castigated in a white paper, a fact suggested by Mr. Pedrosa of the Philippines.

2. Mr. Acheson performed a post-mortem on a still-living organism. He used a history book to influence history. He accused a friendly government of every conceivable crime—dishonesty, stupidity, thievery, bad faith, corruption—while we sat with representatives of that government in the UN and counted on its votes to support us in the Far Eastern Commission.

3. Mr. Acheson, moreover, painted the Communists as men of virtue, whose only real fault is that they were working in the interests of Russia. And he completely discredited the Chinese anti-Communists, which by the white paper's own documentation, were waging a war against communism while Mr. Acheson was still entranced by Edgar Snow, Owen Lattimore and Alger Hiss.

4. And Mr. Acheson wrote off any and all elements of the Nationalist Government with whom we could have worked out some form of united action. In effect, he gave a kind of de facto recognition to the Red conquest of all China, which was not then actually a fact. This "recognition" gave enormous strength of the Communist elements in Southeast Asia, a territory which Mr. Acheson piously announced the United States would defend—by appealing to the UN.

Nowhere in the white paper is there the frank admission that the State Department had promoted the myth that the Chinese Reds were agrarian reformers. This fundamental error, and its evil consequences, are covered up. There is the pretense that the State Department knew all along how wicked, totalitarian and subservient to Moscow the Chinese Reds were; and how necessary it was, for America's vital interests, to save China from the Reds.

The white paper itself, however, smashes this pretense. Buried in the extracts are portion of memoranda of John Davies and John Stewart Service, State Department career officers who were the most bitter critics of the Chiang regime.

The time was 1943-1945 when the tide had turned against Germany and Japan. Russia was free to spread her totalitarian poison. At this crucial juncture the Davies-Service team began thumping the drum for the Chinese Reds. They reported how the Reds

were wholeheartedly fighting the Japanese and promoting a wonderful, popular revolution. Short on documentation, they were long on enthusiasm. Typical quotes:

"This (Communist) revolution has been moderate and democratic. It has improved the economic condition of the peasants, \* \* \* given them democratic self-government, \* \* \* freed them from feudalistic bonds."

"The Chinese Communists (have) moved away from world revolution to nationalism. (They) have positive and widespread popular support, phenomenal vitality and strength. (They) are genuinely of the people."

There is no indication from the Davies-Service dispatches, which had profound influence on the making of our Far East policies, that the Chinese Reds were ruthless totalitarians, practicing terror if necessary, suppressing civil liberties, and adept at the most rigid thought control.

Messrs. Davies and Service stated frankly they wanted the United States to abandon Chiang and his legitimate government. They argued that just as Winston Churchill had publicly proclaimed support for Marshal Tito, President Roosevelt should proclaim support for Mao Tse-tung. Only this, they said, would force Chiang into a coalition with the Communists.

All this, reading like folly now, can be found in the white paper, unrebuked and seemingly unnoticed by Mr. Acheson. But the Davies-Service line was the basis for Mr. Acheson's incredibly intemperate castigation of the Nationalist Government. Among other things, Mr. Acheson stated that the Nationalists had starved their people; had made no effective effort towards a progressive government; had sunk into corruption, reaction and a scramble for place and power; had lost the confidence of the people; and had decayed to the point where their troops had lost the will to fight. The Nationalist armies, said Mr. Acheson, "did not have to be defeated; they disintegrated."

Mr. Acheson, as usual, did not document these sweeping indictments. He did not put corruption in the frame of perspective or balance it against a war-corroded economy. Certainly corruption existed in China, as it exists here. The Chinese call it squeeze and cumshaw; Americans call it 5 percenters and deep freezers. It was exposed and fought there; as it was here.

How did Mr. Acheson weigh confidence in China? Apparently not by the 33,000,000 Chinese refugees from Communist territory, who sought haven in Nationalist territory.

They couldn't all be landlords and reactionaries.

Mr. Acheson excoriated the Nationalists for not promoting constitutionalism. In 1947-48, Chiang led his people toward a democratic constitution and their first experience in popular voting—but the Secretary of State brushed off this progressive effort, that is, if he had heard of it.

The Chinese Reds had themselves provided the answer to Mr. Acheson's charge that the Nationalist armies did not fight. Their official New China News Agency estimated Communist casualties at 1,432,900 in 3 years. Of these, 622,000 were suffered from July 1, 1948 to July 1, 1949—the crucial year, according to Mr. Acheson, when the Nationalists had disintegrated.

The white paper does contain one important, less black picture of Chiang. It was drawn by China's foremost scholar, Dr. Hu Shih, one-time Ambassador to the United States. In December 1948 our Ambassador reported he had talked with Dr. Hu. He said:

"The conversation with Hu was especially saddening because he represents the finest type of patriotic idealism in his attempt to be loyal to the Chiang government. Hu's argument is that communism is so implacable and intolerant, so diabolically thorough in its indoctrination and so ruthless in enforcing its totalitarian control even in China

that Chiang Kai-shek should be supported despite his shortcomings because he alone sees this and has been uncompromising in resisting it."

Dr. Hu perceived, as Mr. Acheson still does not, that had as the Nationalist Government might be, it cannot be as bad for China—and the world—as communism. In politics the choice is not likely to be between good and bad, but between the lesser of two evils.

But nothing in the white paper is more sickening than its misrepresentations of the amount of aid the United States sent the Nationalists. The aid supposedly sent amounted to \$2,000,000,000. According to the white paper it was tossed down the rat-hole of Nationalist corruption. But when the listing is examined, it is clear that none of it, save for the \$400,000,000 military-economic program forced on the State Department by Congress in 1948, was actually designed to combat communism.

The other items include lend-lease equipment provided the Chinese to combat the Japanese. UNRRA benefits which are listed were for postwar relief and rehabilitation, of which Red China received a share. The surplus property sales, by express order of General Marshall, did not include weapons to fight armed communism.

Underlying all the figures of aid is, of course, the basic attitude of the State Department's China experts. The white paper annexes are studded with their shrill warnings against aid lest Chiang use it to fight the Reds. In a monstrous twist of animosity these pro-Communist partisans now blame Chiang for using aid ineffectively against the Communists.

For its own purposes the white paper makes much of the steady deterioration of morale in Nationalist China. Yet, the fact is that United States diplomacy delivered blow after blow to Nationalist morale—climaxed by the white paper. For the mighty American champion of world freedom had singled out the Nationalist leaders as too contemptible for encouragement. Yet Mr. Acheson could say, with a straight face, that the State Department had "pursued vigorously the objective of assisting the Nationalist Government."

And now Mr. Acheson has decided to abandon Formosa. He had already written off the island fortress prior to the Korean War. In a secret memorandum smoked out by the United Press last January the State Department advised its attachés abroad to sell the public the idea that Formosa was of no strategic value.

Politically, geographically, and strategically, the memo said, Formosa "is in no way especially distinguished or important." This was not the State Department view on June 3, 1945. The State Department bulletin then stated that "with the exception of Singapore, no location in the Far East occupies such a controlling position" as does Formosa.

Neither is it the view of the top military strategists. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in the Formosa statement the administration wanted to suppress, had stated that "the occupation of Formosa by Communist forces would be a direct threat to the security of the Pacific area and to the United States Forces performing their lawful and necessary functions in that area."

But Mr. Acheson doesn't think so and by his recent actions he again undermined anti-Communist hopes in China. Time-Life correspondent John Osborne, reporting last October 2 from Formosa, quoted a member of the Chinese Nationalist cabinet:

"If I could see Mr. Acheson tomorrow morning, I would ask him just two questions. Does he want us to live, or does he want us to die? Does he want us to grow strong on this island, or does he want to throw us off this island?"

Representative HUGH SCOTT, on his recent return from Korea, reported that American

troops there wanted to know: "What about this guy Acheson? Is he on our side?"

They had good cause to wonder. While American troops were fighting a bitter war in Korea Mr. Acheson's be-nice-to-Russia policies continued. Even the American Federation of Labor rebelled at Mr. Acheson's desire to continue business as usual with Russia and her satellites. Said A. F. of L. President William Green last September:

"We should stop shipping goods to Russia and other Communist countries because they will use them to prepare for war against us."

But Mr. Acheson persuaded Mr. Truman to condemn the refusal of A. F. of L. longshoremen to unload Soviet-manufactured furs and crab meat on American docks. Mr. Truman announced that he and Mr. Acheson were making foreign policy—not the longshoremen.

It was Mr. Acheson's foreign policy which led directly to Korea.

On January 12, 1950, in a speech before the National Press Club in Washington, Mr. Acheson virtually abandoned Asia to Russia.

Mr. Acheson declared that our defensive perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus. This policy statement immediately ruled out any defense of Korea or Formosa—both lying above that perimeter.

Mr. Acheson jeered at Senator ROBERT A. TAFT's proposal that we send a fleet to protect Formosa against Red invasion. He said he didn't realize that the Ohio Republican was a military expert.

Prior to that Mr. Acheson had sanctioned the withdrawal of American troops from South Korea. Had our occupation of Korea continued possibly the North Korean attack would not have taken place. Had the attack taken place, however, our troops who landed there last June would have had adequate bases, supplies, and equipment at hand.

Following the American withdrawal, Mr. Acheson announced: "If South Korea were invaded, our attitude would be that South Korea would be able to resist."

Mr. Acheson, whose sole military training consisted of several months in the Navy during World War I, had never consulted with General MacArthur on Far East policies. Instead it was Owen Lattimore who was asked by the State Department for advice on what to do in the Far East.

And Mr. Lattimore, in a secret memorandum to the State Department, proposed that Korea should be allowed to fall without making it look as if the United States had pushed it. Syngman Rhee to Mr. Lattimore was just a little Chiang Kai-shek.

With this background, the masters of the Kremlin thought they would face no United States opposition in taking over Korea. But they miscalculated. For President Truman, disregarding Mr. Acheson, decided that he had been pushed around enough by the Russians.

But Mr. Acheson's appeasement policies continued. Although we pledged our naval and air power to prevent a Red invasion of Formosa, we prevented Chiang from continuing offensive operations against the Red-held mainland. And we rejected Chiang's offer of American-equipped, battle-hardened Nationalist troops for Korea.

According to Mr. Acheson, the question of Formosa's ultimate fate will be settled by the United Nations, thus paving the way for an inevitable impartial high-level junking of Chiang's right to maintain his government on Formosa.

This was recognized by General MacArthur in the statement to the Veterans of Foreign Wars Mr. Acheson sought to suppress:

"Nothing could be more fallacious than the threadbare argument of those who advocate appeasement in the Pacific that if we defend Formosa we alienate continental Asia.

Those who speak thus do not understand the Orient."

Throughout the Korean episode Mr. Acheson did his utmost to appease Red China. About the only action taken toward the Peiping regime—which did as much as Russia to encourage the North Korean aggression—was to concede it was a mistake for an American plane to have strafed Red Chinese territory.

The game was to do anything to keep Red China out of the Korean war. The Chinese Red leaders, adept at the art of blackmail, demanded as their price United Nations recognition. And, according to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Mr. Acheson agreed—playing a double game in that he assured the American people he would oppose such recognition. But everything points to the fact that Mr. Acheson has already agreed, in behind the scenes' maneuvering at Lake Success, to such an outcome—following the November elections.

While Mr. Acheson appeased, General MacArthur won the war in Korea. But it took American forces 3 months, many ignominious reverses and heavy casualties before they could take the offensive. It was a miracle that General MacArthur's small and poorly equipped forces escaped another Bataan.

This is the Acheson record. This is the record based on information already made public. What the hidden record is—what Mr. Acheson has done behind the scenes—the American people may never know.

But one thing is certain even if Mr. Acheson is eventually forced to resign by an outraged public opinion.

For any lasting reform of our foreign policy the State Department will have to be thoroughly cleansed of 9 years of Mr. Acheson's influence. For at no time in American history has the prestige of that Department sunk as low as it now sags under Dean Acheson. A drastic house cleaning is in order.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our American Duty," published in the Milwaukee Sentinel.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### OUR AMERICAN DUTY

The blundering and disloyal foreign policies of the New Deal are taking this country into complete disaster, both military and economic.

Our sovereignty has been impaired by making us a virtual vassal of the United Nations, which disrupts our councils, and seeks to fly its mongrel flag over our public buildings.

Our wealth is dissipated to support socialism abroad and to defend alien peoples who are not willing to defend themselves.

The lives of our young men are being sacrificed in a desperate war which our purported allies are not trying to help us win on the battlefields and are conspiring to make us lose in the mazes of diplomacy and duplicity.

For our own survival it is imperative that we extricate ourselves from these destroying situations at once.

Without even inadequate support from others in the United Nations we are fighting almost alone against massed hordes on the Asian continent.

Continuing the war means only the slaughter of millions in a Quixotic American attempt to conquer a vast and distant population.

First and foremost, therefore, this country should withdraw its armed forces from the invasion areas.

We should get our troops out of Korea as quickly as possible.

We should come home to our own country, reconstruct our defenses, and give heed to our own security and welfare.

This might be a defeat for the New Deal, which is responsible for our dismal plight.

It would not be a defeat for the United States, but merely an act of self-preservation. Secondly, we should get out of the United Nations.

That organization has not sustained us in the war that we undertook in its behalf.

Instead, it has interfered with our operations.

Furthermore, it is conniving to admit the enemy into a privileged membership where the enemy could dictate peace terms.

Accordingly, the United Nations should let Red China in—and leave the United States out.

Then let the United Nations see how it gets along.

This country has maintained the United Nations since its inception, with no return in loyalty or gratitude.

So let those who run the United Nations pay for the United Nations—and fight its wars.

Finally, we should end our unrequited efforts to support and supply an ingrate Europe.

Even England, our supposedly staunch ally, has not genuinely backed us in our solitary United Nations war, nor assisted us elsewhere.

On the contrary, Marxist England formally recognized the Chinese Communist government and collaborates with Marxist France in preventing an European rearmament.

Europe has intimated it no longer wants our martial help.

This is Europe's attitude, let Europe look out for itself, and see how Europe gets along.

Since obviously we stand alone, we should have the wisdom and the courage to act alone.

For our duty is to protect our own people and to foster our own Nation.

Mr. McCARTHY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in connection with the remarks I made earlier today, a letter which I wish to read. Will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield for that purpose?

Mr. CAIN. Yes; if I am permitted to do so, I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Incidentally, Mr. President, the letter I am about to read is not apropos of what the Senator from Washington is now discussing, but it has to do with the remarks I made earlier this afternoon.

The letter comes from Pfc A. J. Mullen, who has been in Korea. I think we should keep his letter in mind as we watch the fiddling of the United Nations while it debates whether we are at war. This letter comes from a young man who knows we are at war. I read the letter:

DEAR MA AND DAD: I'm on my way home, but I'm bringing some bad news with me. I hope you don't take this so hard as some people do.

I went to Korea and got wounded in both of my legs and they had to be amputated. I don't remember exactly how it happened—I only remember the explosion and the hospital at Inchon. They are in good condition at the present and it will be no more than a month before I will see you all again.

I am on the *General G. M. Randall* at sea. I'm relieved to get away from it all, mom and dad, and there will be something to

look forward to when I see you people again. The only thing that I'm worried about are you folks. I don't want you to be worrying and going around with tears in your eyes. The best years of my life are ahead of me. For your information, they amputated from my knees down.

Well that's all for now. The rest can wait. I'll be writing you more often now, and once again I beg of you to keep cool and I will see you soon. Please excuse the hand-writing as I am a bit shaky at the present.

I will write again soon.

Your loving son,

BOB.

Mr. President, I do not think the letter needs any comment. I wish to commend it to the reading and consideration of those who are debating whether the Chinese are at war with us.

#### FREIGHT FORWARDERS AND MOTOR COMMON CARRIERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5967) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to clarify the status of freight forwarders and their relationship with motor common carriers.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senate has now before it for consideration House bill 5967, which has been passed by the House by a very substantial margin. The bill deals with a problem which has been before the Congress for many months and which has received the attention of both the House and the Senate Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The bill, which was reported by the House committee unanimously and by the Senate committee by a very substantial majority, is before the Senate at this time because in the opinion of those who favor the bill it involves a problem which must be solved. So the bill should be considered at this time and passed by the Senate.

Mr. President, House bill 5967 would solve a pressing and important transportation problem. As I said, the prompt solution of the problem is a pressing necessity at this time. The House agreed to certain amendments, which have removed all valid objections to the bill. The bill simply maintains the status quo.

Mr. President, the bill deals with a highly technical matter, which would take some time to discuss. It is a matter, however, which has received the attention of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in very lengthy hearings, during which all sides of the question were discussed. It deals with the problem of freight forwarders.

#### 1. THE PROBLEM WHICH THE BILL SOLVES

Freight forwarders have been regulated as carriers under Federal law since 1942. Shippers throughout the Nation depend upon the coordinated service which forwarders provide in the transportation of less-than-carload-lot freight. Forwarder service is of vital importance to both the domestic economy and the defense effort of the Nation.

That service is threatened by an interpretation of the statute which regulates forwarders.

The interpretation, made by the ICC, holds that the statute does not define forwarders as common carriers, but as agencies of transportation having a

similitude to public utilities. Based on that view of the status of forwarders, the interpretation further holds that an important phase of the business, whereby forwarders coordinate their services with those of motor carriers, under flexible agreements for hauling forwarder freight in truckload lots between forwarder stations, must be discontinued. This practice has existed, openly, satisfactorily, without complaint, and with great advantage to the shipping public, and, I may say, to the little shipper, for more than 30 years.

The order making this interpretation has been postponed from time to time pending enactment of corrective legislation, or similar corrective legislation such as that which is now before us, and is now scheduled to become effective May 1, 1951.

The bill cures the problem by clearly recognizing forwarders for what they are, and have always been, namely, common carriers similar to the American Express Agency.

Further, it authorizes continuance of the practices which have evolved and proved their worth over the years, and recognizes them for what they have always been—contracts.

#### 2. PROMPT SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM IS A PRESSING NECESSITY

The maintenance of an adequate and efficient transportation system, in all its aspects, has perhaps never been of more critical importance to the Nation. No one questions that freight forwarders fill an important place in our transportation system. Heavy use of forwarders is made by all the armed services and defense establishments, and by all the shippers of the country.

In addition to providing a coordinated and expedited transportation service which is not otherwise available, the forwarders are of tremendous importance in the conservation and efficient utilization of the existing facilities of other carriers. Rail boxcars are today in critically short supply. Statistics show that freight-forwarder cars are loaded approximately twice as heavily as cars loaded with ordinary less-than-carload-lot freight, which is what forwarder traffic consists of. Forwards also enable motor carriers to make much more efficient utilization of their equipment by eliminating dockings, loading more heavily, and eliminating unnecessary paper work, transfers, and the like.

It would be foolhardy to permit artificial and unnecessary barriers to cripple freight-forwarder service, particularly at this time.

Mr. President, in connection with the original bill, the House considered several amendments which removed some objections made by the railroads and others involved, and those amendments are now contained in the bill. It is my understanding, from reading the House hearings, the testimony of those who appeared before the committee, that the opposition to the original bill on the part of some railroads—not on the part of all—has now been removed, and they have so testified. After the amendments were placed in the bill, and after the factual data was placed in both the

House and the Senate committee reports, the House committee unanimously reported the bill, and it was passed by the House by a very substantial margin.

All the bill does, as I said, is to maintain the status quo which now exists in our transportation system. Some argument has been made to the effect that possibly we might wait a period of time in order to make a study of the whole transportation system as it involves freight forwarders and all the other methods of railroad transportation and truck transportation. I believe at this time that would be somewhat disastrous, because all the bill does is, as I said, place the matter in status quo. If we decide, after sufficient study of the transportation systems' problems, that we want to make some changes we can do so in another bill.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will act on the bill promptly. The ICC has had the matter before it for many, many months. Lengthy hearings have been held by the Senate committee. The subject is highly technical. Most of us have come to the conclusion that the bill should be passed in order to retain the freight forwarders in the position they now are.

As I said, the amendments which were proposed were agreed to by the railroads of the country who at first were opposed to certain portions of the bill. The purpose of amendments is to keep our transportation system and important segments of that system alive.

Freight forwarders play a great part in the life of the small shipper. A freight forwarder does not operate in the main with carload lots. He picks up various lots from the outlying districts and combines them into a carload lot and ships them to another small point that could not take advantage of a terminal point.

I wish to read from the hearings before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Small business was represented in those hearings. This is what was said on behalf of small business regarding this service which we now seek to keep in status quo. I read from page 312 of the hearings:

Small business needs forwarder service because, as even those opposing the bill admit—

Reference is made to the original bill prior to the adoption of the amendments—

because, as even those opposing the bill admit, it is the only i. c. l. service available on small shipments which combines fast, dependable schedules at standard—not premium—rates. In other words, if your local shoe store did not have forwarder service to move its 150- or 200-pound shipments, it would have to turn to express, air, or some other high-cost means of transportation in order to get its goods shipped on time.

The hearings are replete with testimony of small business which have taken advantage of the freight-forwarder service during the 40 years it has been in existence. It is a vital part of the transportation system. I hope the Senate will promptly pass this bill. It has been the subject of much highly

technical discussion for many many months. If, after further study it is desired that a change be made, such a change can be made in a new transportation bill.

Mr. President, I have used a portion of a statement dealing with the matter. I now ask that the remainder of the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remainder of the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### 3. HOW THE HOUSE AMENDMENTS REMOVE VALID OBJECTIONS

Based on its own comprehensive hearings, as well as the record of the Senate hearings on companion bill S. 2113, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce undertook to remove all valid objections to the bill by making four major amendments, as follows:

1. A requirement that no contract, between any freight forwarder and any motor carrier, shall unduly prefer or prejudice any other freight forwarder. This amendment is designed primarily to protect smaller forwarders. Some fears were expressed that large forwarders would be able to make more favorable arrangements than small forwarders, and this amendment effectively allays such fears.

2. A requirement that contracts shall be consistent with the national transportation policy. Despite the fact that the national transportation policy governs each provision of the act, some persons feared that the bill might abrogate or bypass that policy, and the amendment insures against such a contingency.

3. A requirement that forwarders pay full tariff rates of the motor carriers for line-haul movements in truckload lots for distances exceeding 450 miles. Testimony shows that such arrangements now, and in the past, do not generally apply for distances exceeding 450 miles. To meet the objections of some who feared that disruptive changes in practice might be made in the future, the bill includes the distance limitation. This does not limit the use of trucks for any distance, but places a limitation on what the forwarder must pay for such service. In effect this provision merely maintains status quo.

4. A provision the effect of which is to require forwarders to recover any claims they have against the railroads on the basis of the terms of the bill of lading. This is the method declared lawful by the Supreme Court, and again this amendment is merely a status quo provision.

These amendments satisfied all members of the House committee, which unanimously reported the bill as amended. The House of Representatives then passed the bill on August 9. Thus H. R. 5967 comes before the Senate as a compromise and as a substitute for S. 2113 it should receive prompt Senate approval.

The few remaining objections are not directed specifically at the purposes of the bill, but stem from a competitive opposition to freight forwarders as such. The objectors come primarily from the ranks of long-distance truck operators who do not work with forwarders but only compete with them, and from some very large shippers who in the main conduct their own forwarding operations. Their arguments, such as that the bill is "legislative rate making," and authorizes "cut rates," are spurious and misleading, for the bill does not involve rates which the public pays but relates to joint arrangements between carriers.

### 4. THE HEARINGS DEVELOPED ALL FACTUAL DATA

Nine days of public hearings were held by the Senate and House committees handling the bills. Every interested person in the

United States had full opportunity to present his views. The hearings have been printed and are available for all to see.

Without attempting to analyze the testimony presented at the hearings, it is sufficient to say that the freight forwarding industry is unanimously and strongly in favor of the bill; that every shipper who testified that he makes regular and substantial use of freight forwarder service supports the legislation; and that without a single exception the actual motor carrier operators who testified were enthusiastically in favor of passage of the bill.

Opposition to the bills as introduced was expressed by the national trucking organization, whose witness admitted that there was a divided opinion among the members and that those motor carriers who cooperate in the handling of forwarder traffic favor the bill. The shippers who opposed the bill were either large shippers or shippers so situated that they can and do ship their own carloads or combine with others to ship in carloads, and who do not need the services of forwarders. Three large railroads opposed the bills as introduced, but the record indicates conclusively that these railroads have no opposition to the bill as amended by the House.

The House committee report (No. 2489) states very positively that:

"Testimony was given in the hearings both for and against the bill. Most of the objections to the bill have been removed by the amendment made by the committee."

There was complete unanimity within the committee in approval of the amended bill.

### 5. THE BILL MERELY MAINTAINS STATUS QUO

H. R. 5967 is essentially a bill to maintain status quo. It does not change any existing practice, but presents an interpretation of present law from disrupting a service that has long proved its worth to the shippers and the Nation.

Pending studies regarding long-range governmental policy in the transportation field will not be adversely affected by passage of the bill. Since the bill does no more than maintain a service as it has been built up and operated for 35 years or more, it will serve the purposes of such studies by preventing interim changes.

The facts overwhelmingly demand prompt passage of the bill. We need and must have the best that transportation has to offer, and H. R. 5967 is a constructive proposal of the utmost urgency and timeliness.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, at the last session of the Senate, when this bill was on the calendar and ready for consideration, I held up its consideration for two principal reasons: First, I am opposed to further diversion of traffic from the rails to the highways until the completion of a further extensive study, which is now under way, in regard to the cost of truck transportation on the highways, the damage to the highways, and whether the truckers are bearing their proper proportion of the cost of the original construction and the maintenance of the highways.

Of course, this bill deals with freight forwarders, which, as the Senator from Washington stated, have rendered an extremely constructive service to the shipping public during many, many years. Heretofore the freight forwarders have used the rails for their freight-forwarding business, getting the advantage of the lower rate for carload lots, as compared with the less-than-carload-lot rate which would be charged to the individual shipper were it not for the intervening freight forwarder.

I am opposed in principle, then, to further diversion until that study is completed. Such a study is now under way.

The last suggestion of the Senator from Washington was to the effect that if there is not a satisfactory solution of this problem by means of the bill now before the Senate, the bill, if passed, can be changed and amended when the general Transportation Act comes before the coming Congress for consideration. As to that suggestion, it is my hope that proper attention will be given to the matter at that time.

In the second place, this bill would end the confusion which now exists over the very nature of freight forwarders, as to whether they are common carriers or whether, because of their operations, they are in the nature of a public utility, chargeable with a public interest, and therefore subject to regulation. There is confusion at the present time, and there would be greater confusion if the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission were issued. That order has been held up for many, many months now, possibly running to a year, at the request of the committee. So the effect of the bill would be constructive.

The House adopted an amendment which would limit the distance of freight-forwarder shipments by truck to 450 miles, as I recall, so that transcontinental transportation over the highways by truck would not be available, and therefore the field of railway carriers would not be further invaded.

Not wishing to interfere with the established use of freight forwarders, and realizing that the next Congress will have this entire problem under consideration, and in view of the further fact that we should not hold up the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, at this time I shall offer no objection to the passage of the bill, looking to the report of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which is now being prepared along with a general Transportation Act, in connection with which all the problems which are involved in this bill can be considered.

So, Mr. President, although I oppose in principle any further diversion, and although I also oppose a further invasion of this field and a legalizing of that which has been developing in it over a number of years, in spite of those objections I shall not at this time oppose the passage of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 5967) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, a corresponding Senate bill, Senate bill 2113, will be indefinitely postponed.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS—AMENDMENTS TO RAILWAY LABOR ACT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, heretofore I have given notice that we would take up certain bills. One of them is Senate bill 3295, a bill to amend the Railway Labor Act. Before I move that the Sen-

ate consider that bill, perhaps we should have a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me make inquiry of the distinguished majority leader. I hate to suggest that the Senate take a recess at this time until tomorrow. I wonder whether there is any other bill the distinguished majority leader intends to bring up today. If other bills which are ready for consideration can be handled today, then, if it meets with the approval of the majority leader, perhaps he will agree to have the Senate make the bill proposing amendments to the Railway Labor Act the unfinished business. Of course, there is a unanimous-consent agreement to have the Senate vote at 2 o'clock tomorrow on the rent-control bill. Thereafter we could proceed with debate on the amendments to the Railway Labor Act.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there are two other bills in which the Senator is interested, one being House bill 9313, amending the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. WHERRY. If the majority leader will yield, let me say that I think one Member on his side of the aisle is very much interested in the consideration of that bill.

I am not averse at all to having that bill considered. I think the distinguished majority leader has another bill in mind, and I am not averse to having it considered.

I shall not object further to the taking up of the bill proposing amendments to the Railway Labor Act; but if that measure is considered, I sincerely request that the majority leader end the session for today following the making of that measure the unfinished business. In other words, I suggest that we follow procedure similar to that which we followed yesterday afternoon. Such a course will provide a day in which Senators who are interested in that measure will be able to return to the Chamber. If that is done, we shall proceed with the debate on that measure, regardless of any other considerations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, ever since the beginning of this short session we have been trying to get the Railway Labor Act amendments considered by the Senate; but every time we are ready to proceed with that measure, it seems that some Senator who is interested in the bill is unavoidably absent. I assume that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is one of the Senators who is vitally interested in the bill. However, I have given this notice, and it seems to me we should proceed with the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not intend to object; in fact, I have cooperated with the majority leader in attempting to have considered the bill proposing amendments to the Railway Labor Act. However, in order to be able to advise Senators who are interested in the measure, I should like to have that much time.

On the other hand, if the majority leader wishes to have the Senate proceed with that measure, I am in complete accord. I believe that those who wish to bring forward proposed legislation should be given their day in court, so

to speak, and I shall not oppose further a move to consider the bill. Therefore, if the majority leader wishes to move consideration of the bill, that will be agreeable to me.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is apparent that we cannot take up for consideration Senate bill 3295, to amend the Railway Labor Act and to authorize agreements providing for union membership and agreements for deduction from the wages of carriers' employees for certain purposes and under certain conditions. I have conferred with the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and other members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I am advised that there is now in process an attempt to effect a settlement, through negotiations among various members of the labor unions which are vitally interested in the bill, and it is believed that perhaps by tomorrow at this time a mutual arrangement can be effected which will be satisfactory to everyone. So I am not going to ask that the bill be considered now. It seems to me we might well take a recess.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President—

Mr. LUCAS. I know that the Senator from Washington desires to make a speech.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There was considerable confusion at the time the Senator from Illinois made his statement, and I did not hear everything he said relative to the railway labor bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I said the railway labor bill would not be made the unfinished business at this time. We shall not take it up until after we have concluded consideration of the rent-control bill, which will be tomorrow. It is my understanding that prior to our taking up further the railway labor bill Senators who are interested in the measure will perhaps be able to effect a conciliation with respect to the provisions of the bill, to the end that everyone who is concerned with it will be satisfied. If such result should be achieved, we should not have much trouble passing the bill, and it may obviate consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], which perhaps would take considerable time to discuss.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the observation of the Senator from Illinois, because several Senators on this side of the aisle are intensely interested in having the railway labor bill come up for consideration. Perhaps a conciliation can be effected. I

thank the distinguished majority leader for his statement.

#### AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to state also that Calendar No. 2578, the bill (H. R. 9313) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, dealing with the disposition of certain surplus property, will not be taken up until after next Tuesday. I am advised by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that on Tuesday next a meeting will be held by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and he believes that at that time all members will be in a position to report a bill which will be somewhat different from the present bill and satisfactory to all members of the committee. Am I correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. A few moments ago I received a letter from the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to the effect that he had made an interim report on the present status of certain perishable agricultural commodities under the supervision, management, and control of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and that the report would be ready for presentation to the whole committee on December 12. Therefore, I believe it is advisable that further action on the bill (H. R. 9313) be postponed until after the meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on Tuesday next.

#### FINNISH INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on December 6, 1917, the Finnish Diet and Senate drew up a declaration of independence from Russia. Dear little Finland is small in population and small in territory, but it is great in integrity and valor. It is a small nation, but it maintains principles of freedom and liberty which I wish some of the larger nations of the world might possess today.

As today, December 6, is the thirty-third anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Finland, I would not want to let this opportunity pass without paying a brief word of tribute to the great Finnish people and to the wonderful values which they symbolize. We of Wisconsin are proud of the men, women and children of Finnish descent in our great State, and I know that is true of other States which are blessed by these splendid Americans.

Mr. President, I have prepared a statement on the occasion of the anniversary of Finland's independence, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, Mr. WILEY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY FINLAND'S INDEPENDENCE

On December 6, 1917, the Finnish Diet and Senate drew up a Declaration of Independence from Russia. This followed by two months the advent of the Bolsheviks to power in Russia, after which a period of strikes and other chaotic conditions existed throughout Finland with the people desperate to realize their dream of sovereignty. The dream was realized and the Bolsheviks on January 4, 1948 declared that Finnish independence conformed with their policy

whereupon Sweden and other Scandinavian countries similarly acknowledged the new state.

The pages of Finnish history record thereafter the bloody travail in which the newly born state secured its sovereignty against tremendous odds at home and abroad. The birth of Finland amidst the First World War and following immediately upon the Russian revolution has symbolized the fact that this valiant people has had to fight for its very existence against a background of violence in that corner of the world and elsewhere. Yet the Finns are a people who represent the finest traditions of men working out their destiny and developing prosperity by dint of Herculean labor. The Finns to every American represent thrift, diligence, honesty, and integrity. Their practically miraculous record of payment of debts to our country is a record that is inspiring to all those of us who prize the tradition of fidelity to one's pledged word, fidelity to contracts, fidelity to one's obligations.

Although practically in the mouth of the Communist Russian bear from the very day they were born, the Finns have shown the world that a people with iron in its spine can face up to any challenge. A people which has suffered the most grievous losses on the battlefield, the most ruthless destruction of their homes, the most tremendous of financial reparations, can somehow by dint of courage and sacrifice come back.

I don't suppose in the pages of American history there are chapters of Americans being thrilled to the sagas of another country—chapters which compare with the thrills we felt in our hearts when that tiny little country with its few millions of people absolutely defied the massed hordes of Red Army troops for month after month until at last in 1940 they succumbed to the overwhelming numbers. Even though defeated, even with the cession of territory, even with the granting of special rights, even with the financial burden of reparations upon them, the Finns somehow have held fast to their democratic traditions; have controlled the few Communist traitors in their midst.

In this period when things look so gloomy from so many angles, in this period when men's hopes sink and spirits sag, let us all turn for a few moments at least to contemplation of this brave land and this brave people who have shown us conclusively the immortal heights to which free men and women can rise in selfless sacrifice to great ideals.

I salute the freedom-loving people of Finland with their great history. I salute Americans of Finnish descent who can glory in the background of their forefathers. I pray that the independence which they won and maintained in blood, sweat, and tears will ever be theirs.

God bless valiant Finland, and may she ever be an inspiration to all other countries, large and small, and may she ever show that the light of freedom will definitely not go out, no matter how strong the forces of darkness.

#### PROPOSED CONSIDERATION OF RAILWAY LABOR BILL—ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before I ask the question which I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader, I wish to comment on the reference of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] to the very courageous nation of Finland. I desire the RECORD to show that there are thriving communities and cities in Finland which are north of Ketchikan and Juneau, Alaska. I desire the RECORD to show that the Territory of Alaska occupies practically the same position on the globe with respect to parallels of latitude as the entire Scandi-

navian peninsula. The Scandinavian peninsula supports in prosperity and freedom 13,000,000 people.

Apparently the Senate of the United States is unwilling to give consideration to the statehood bill, which would clear the way for the development under our flag of similar prosperity to that which is enjoyed by the people in Finland.

However, Mr. President, I rose to ask my friend, the majority leader, and through him the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who was on the floor at the time I rose, but who apparently now is absent, what the prospect is for an agreement on consideration of the railway labor bill. I was advised by friends of the railway labor bill that an amendment had been worked out and would be presented to the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. LUCAS. In reply to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, I should like to say that I believe the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] was eager to talk to certain Republican members of the committee, who apparently did not attend the meeting of the committee, in order to see if they would agree to the amendment.

However, Mr. President, I give notice now that in the event we pass the rent-control bill tomorrow afternoon, or as soon as we pass it, I shall ask unanimous consent to consider the railway labor bill. If unanimous consent is not granted I shall move its consideration. I should like to dispose of the measure. I should also like to be able to take up for consideration the Alaska statehood bill. I would do so in preference to taking up the railway labor bill if I thought there was the slightest chance of passing the statehood bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say to my good friend, the majority leader, that when the policy committee of the majority party assembled last September before the Senate recessed we agreed upon an agenda. We agreed upon certain bills and upon the priority with which they would be taken up. The railway labor bill had priority over the statehood bills, because it was understood that there would be no objection made to the consideration of the Railway Act amendments to be proposed. That was my opinion at the time. I was one of the Senators who gave full support to the railway labor bill. However, shortly before the Senate recessed it became apparent that there would be obstacles to the passage of the bill; first, a motion to recommit the bill, and protracted discussion of the motion, and, second, an amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that when the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and other Senators have agreed to the amendment to which the majority leader has now alluded, it will be possible to pass the bill. I shall cooperate in every way I can to have it disposed of, particularly because we gave it priority before the Senate recessed, and it was postponed because it was obvious that we would get no action on it. I have had a very definite feeling that the railway labor bill has been proposed at this session only for the purpose

of preventing action on the statehood bills. If I correctly understand the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I am glad to know that after action is taken or is not taken on the railway labor bill, we may entertain the hope that a motion will be made to return to a consideration of the Alaska statehood bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I entertain the hope that we may be able to return to consideration of the statehood bills provided we can get concrete and definite action on them. However, it is my impression from what I have learned from various Members of the Senate that probably after we finish consideration of the rent-control bill and perhaps the railway labor bill, the Senate will then be considering some emergency legislation dealing with the Korean situation, which I understand will be reported favorably by the Committee on Foreign Relations. Of course if such legislation comes before us, I presume we will have to give our attention to it in preference to a motion to consider the Alaska statehood bill.

I say very sincerely that I share the views of the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] with respect to the admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union as States. However, as I stated once before on the floor of the Senate, I am a realist about certain matters. Having served in the Congress for 12 years—and I know the Senator from Wyoming has served even longer than that—I think I know exactly what is going on with respect to the statehood bills. If a motion were to be made to take them up debate would begin and would continue until Christmas, in my judgment. As I said before, it is a little too late for me now to start to try to break up a filibuster. Someone else may do it if he so desires, but not the Senator from Illinois. I am sure if a filibuster started the Sergeant at Arms would have to get the Senator from Illinois out of bed. I have never believed in filibusters around the clock. I do not believe in them now. So long as the rule exists, there is no possible chance, in my judgment, of getting a vote on the Alaska statehood bill at this short session. It is apparent that certain Senators will not permit us to vote even on the motion to consider the Alaska statehood bill. Even after we took up the bill we would still have a siege.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand the Senator from Illinois to say that in his opinion certain Members of the Senate are so opposed even to the consideration of the statehood bills that they would talk and prevent the consideration of any other measure rather than permit them to come before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator correctly understands the Senator from Illinois. There can be no doubt of it. I have talked with certain Members of the Senate, and that is exactly what is going to happen. That is the reason why I have been moving along with some other bills,

of a minor nature, in order to accomplish something at the short session. I do not propose to sit here all day long and listen to speeches, many of which have nothing to do with the subject matter at hand, so far as Alaska statehood is concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It becomes clear that if there is to be action on any of the other bills, it will be only because the sponsors and friends of statehood are not following the example of those who will not permit consideration of a motion to consider a bill, or allow the motion to come to a vote.

Mr. LUCAS. I concur in what the Senator has said with respect to the statehood bills. Furthermore, the Senator is absolutely correct in the statement as to what was agreed upon by the Democratic policy committee before Congress adjourned in September. The railway labor bill was the one which we agreed to consider first. However, everyone knows about the message which came on the opening day from the President of the United States, definitely requesting the Congress to give first priority to the statehood bills, over all other measures. That is why the Senator from Illinois sought consideration of one of the statehood bills on the opening day. I desired to see whether or not we could at least get an opportunity to vote on the measure at some time. However, as I have previously stated, apparently that cannot be done. I do not propose to delay action upon other measures, of either major or minor importance, which we might possibly get through, simply to kill time when we cannot accomplish anything.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wonder if the majority leader is in a position to give us now some information with reference to what bills may be taken up.

Mr. LUCAS. As the Senator well knows, tomorrow at 2 o'clock the Senate will vote on the rent-control joint resolution. Following that we are to take up the railroad bill. That will probably require the remainder of the afternoon. Probably some measures dealing with the Korean War situation will be reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations tomorrow. If so, they can be taken up on Friday.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wonder if the Senator can tell us when we may expect consideration of the tax bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot tell the Senator that. I can only speculate, as a member of the Finance Committee, which started hearings today. Probably the hearings will last all week. We may not be able to reach the tax bill until the latter part of next week.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I understand, it is the purpose of the majority leader that some bill, whether of great importance or not, will be taken up.

Mr. LUCAS. The tax bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; not the tax bill. I refer to bills on the calendar. As I understand, the Senator proposes to take

up certain bills on the calendar in order to carry on the work of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. There are other bills. There is one very important bill in which the Senator from Wyoming and other Senators are interested. It relates to an amendment to the Clayton Act. I have given notice that we may take up that bill if we encounter a lull in the proceedings.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for a question? Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am very much interested in the statement made by the majority leader that possibly the tax measure will not be brought up until the latter part of next week. That will be the week of December 11.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. I am only guessing in that connection.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask for the judgment of the majority leader. Does he intend, in the event the tax bill is reported the latter part of next week, to hold sessions straight through Saturday, which is the 16th? There will be only 1 week left before Christmas.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot answer the Senator. I do not know when the tax bill will be reported.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it possible that sessions will be held on Saturdays?

Mr. LUCAS. I may say in response to the Senator's inquiry that it is my studied judgment, after considering all the measures of an emergency nature in which the executive branch of the Government is interested, that we shall be here probably right through the Christmas holidays. We shall probably take a couple of days' holiday.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the judgment of the Senator that the Senate will probably hold sessions on the two remaining Saturdays in order to complete its business?

Mr. LUCAS. If it is necessary I shall try to hold the Senate in session on Saturday. I know that the Senator from Nebraska will cooperate with me in that connection.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### EXTENSION OF TIME FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO REPORT ON SENATE RESOLUTION 368

Mr. CAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The matter I desire to present to the Senate entails a unanimous-consent agreement. Senate Resolution 368, submitted by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The matter came to my attention for the first time this morning. I have consulted the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary. The resolution involves much more than appears on its face. The matter is an intricate one. It seems to me the Committee on the Judiciary should have a little more time to consider the questions involved, and not be compelled to report on the resolution on Friday of this week.

What is more, some of the members of the Judiciary Committee are out of

town. I have issued a call for a meeting of the committee tomorrow morning. I am very much concerned whether it will be possible to have a quorum present at that time.

I wonder whether it would be possible to have at least the majority and minority leaders present, so that I might ask unanimous consent of the Senate that the committee may have until 1 week from today to report. The matter is highly important and is of grave concern. It should receive serious study. I find it not too easy to answer the problem as one might think.

For the reason I have stated, I hope I may obtain unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until 1 week from today in which to make a report on Senate Resolution 368.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder whether the Senator will permit me to make a suggestion.

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. I came but recently from a meeting of the Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is chairman. The statement which I have been making will take me 15 or 20 minutes to complete. I am perfectly willing to proceed as rapidly as possible in presenting my statement, in order that I may return to the subcommittee meeting, so that the Senator from Tennessee may come to the Senate Chamber to resolve this question, in which he has such a deep interest.

Mr. McCARRAN. I would certainly agree with that suggestion. I bring up the matter now only because of the time within which we must report. I thought it best that I bring up the matter today in some way, if possible.

Mr. CAIN. Certainly. I think the Senator from Tennessee would desire to come to the floor and to be here with the Senator from Nevada as soon as possible.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, day before yesterday, I believe it was, there was submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary Senate Resolution 368, which, among other things, reads as follows:

Whereas the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce has reported to the Senate that subpoenas have been issued for certain persons named in the body of this resolution, and that these persons are important witnesses necessary to the investigation being conducted by that committee pursuant to Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress, second session, and that the said persons have not been located despite diligent search, and that the committee has reasonable cause to believe that the said persons will not appear in response to subpoenas but will continue in hiding to avoid appearance before the committee; and

Whereas the appearance and testimony of the witnesses named in the body of this resolution is material and necessary in order that the committee may properly execute the functions assigned to it and may obtain information necessary as a basis for legislation:

Then follows a list of names, after which appears the following language:

That, for the purpose of executing warrants issued in accordance with this resolu-

tion, the Sergeant at Arms may, by blanket order or orders, deputize all law enforcement officers of the Federal Government; and

That the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce may discharge any of the persons taken into custody under authority of this resolution upon proper assurance, by recognition or otherwise, that he will appear for interrogation when required. The committee may require such assurance as it deems necessary not to exceed \$25,000 for any one witness.

The order submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary was that the committee report not later than Friday of this week. In the short time I have been present in the Senate today, having returned only this morning, I have investigated the question involved and find it to be one of serious moment. It is not to be lightly dealt with. It is a question of the arrest of persons by the Senate of the United States, or by a committee thereof. I respectfully submit to this body that it should not be dealt with lightly or in a brief time.

I move that the Judiciary Committee be allowed to and including Monday, December 18, 1950, in which to report to the Senate. I am advised that this is a privileged motion, that I have a right to make it; I therefore make it as a privileged motion.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Does that in any way displace the legislation that is now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that, inasmuch as it is a privileged motion, it does not displace the pending business. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion having been agreed to, the request of the Senator from Nevada is now in full force and effect.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, a moment ago the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary made a motion to extend the time within which the committee may report on the resolution offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. The motion was to extend until the 18th of December the time within which to report.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I voted in favor of the motion of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. At the time there were only five or six Senators on the floor. I do not wish to ask for a quorum call at this late hour, but

I think that in all fairness if some Senators do not agree with the action taken, because so few Members of the Senate were present, they should have an opportunity to file a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to. I have the highest respect for the Senator from Nevada. I voted in favor of his motion. I am not holding any brief or portfolio for the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who offered the resolution. He is well able to defend his own position. However, in view of the small attendance, I suggest that the motion should not be made at this time without first having a quorum call. I shall not ask for a quorum call, but in view of the small attendance I believe Senators who do not agree with the action taken should have their day in court.

Mr. McCARRAN. If ample time were available, I believe the Senator from Nebraska would be justified in taking the position which he now takes. However, it is only a question of asking for more time.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand, and I voted with the Senator from Nevada. I believe the Senator who offered the resolution ought to have an opportunity to defend his cause. I am for the Senator who is making the investigation. I am not here to uphold his hand, but the Senator from Nevada knows that there are no more than seven Senators on the floor at the present time. We are confronted with a motion which will practically bar further consideration of the resolution of the Senator from Tennessee. I hope the Senator will withdraw his motion.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will withdraw my motion if the Senator from Illinois will withdraw his motion.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator from Nevada withdraws his motion, of course, I shall also withdraw my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both motions are withdrawn.

#### EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington wishes to address himself to Senate Joint Resolution 207, which will be before the Senate for action tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock. The Senator from Washington opposes the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 207 for the following 10 reasons:

First. Federal rent control does not expire December 31, 1950.

Second. Rent control continues in eight-hundred-odd cities within 32 States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico from December 31, 1950, to June 30, 1951.

Third. Senate Joint Resolution 207, as of this afternoon, affects only 1,600 cities with less than 4,000,000 rental units.

Fourth. Those 1,600 cities, by their actions, to date, have indicated that they do not want Federal rent control.

Fifth. Those 1,600 cities have had since June 1950 the opportunity to request an additional 6 months' extension of Federal rent control.

Sixth. Those cities still have until December 31, 1950, to request an extension.

Seventh. Those cities can regulate rents, if needed, at their local level. Examples are Columbia, S. C., and Flint, Mich.

Eighth. Rent control will not produce one single unit of housing.

Ninth. Passage of Senate Joint Resolution 207 repudiates the local-option provision given American communities since April 1949.

Tenth. No witness heard was in opposition to further extension, and no testimony was presented by opponents.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington will not detain the Senate for very long, but does desire to address himself to the pending business and point out to his colleagues the complete lack of any provable necessity requiring the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 207.

As one of but many within the Congress throughout the past 4 years who has been in sturdy opposition to the Federal Government remaining in the private-property-management business long after wartime emergency controls had ceased to exist in every other segment of American enterprise, I do not on this afternoon propose to reexplore, reexamine, or rediscuss the broad field of Federal rent control—its evils, its maladministration, its constitutionality, or its artificiality. Rather, Mr. President, I propose to place before the Senate on behalf of those millions of property owners solid and, I believe, compelling reasons why the proposed legislation is not needed, cannot be justified, and is contrary to the best interests of our present huge national preparedness undertaking. I remind my colleagues that no single word was heard by the Banking and Currency Committee in opposition to this joint resolution. Those qualified to sincerely and seriously speak for American property owners were not invited to appear and testify.

Mr. President, let me now read just one short sentence from the committee report. We find this statement on page 2, the eighth line of the last paragraph:

It is primarily these approximately 4,000,000 units which will be affected by this joint resolution.

What and where are these estimated 4,000,000 units? They are the estimated number of rental-housing units located in some 1,600 cities, towns, or villages of over a thousand population which have not yet, as of this date, requested the additional 6 months' Federal rent control permitted in the present law. Some 800 cities, with an estimated 3,500,000 rental units, have, as of this date, asked for the additional 6 months of Federal regulation.

So, Mr. President, I again quote the short sentence found in the report, for it correctly states the very heart and soul of the proposed legislation:

It is primarily these approximately 4,000,000 units which will be affected by this joint resolution.

The present law does not expire on December 31, 1950. The present law remains operative in 32 States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico. It continues to be in effect in more than 800 American communities

whose population is 23,000,000 people. It is, therefore, clear that Senate Joint Resolution 207 is not needed to extend the present law, as many Senators appear to think is necessary.

Senate Joint Resolution 207 merely would continue to impose on 1,600 American communities a Federal control which they have said they do not want, which they have indicated they do not need. Since April 1, 1949, the date of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949, Congress has given, in that act, the States, the counties, and the cities of America the right of self-determination with respect to Federal regulations. Nine States have exercised that "States' rights" provision. I think the Senate would be interested in knowing what are the nine States which have taken advantage in recent months of a Federal statute and on their own volition removed themselves from the jurisdiction of Federal rent control. Senate Joint Resolution 207, if passed, will have no force or effect on these nine American States. They are the State of New York, the most populous State in the United States, the State of Texas, not only a large State geographically but a State in which we find some of the most rapidly growing American cities, Houston and Dallas, for example, large, fast, rapidly growing communities which in recent months have gotten along, pretty well by the way, without benefit of Federal rent control administered from on high; the State of Virginia, the State of Utah, the States of Arizona, Nebraska, Alabama, and all of Mississippi except the city of Biloxi.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Was I correct in understanding the distinguished Senator from Washington to say that, if the measure now under consideration should be passed, because of the language it contains, it would have no effect whatever upon the States the Senator has just named?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Wisconsin is quite correct.

Mr. WILEY. In other words, by reason of the fact that a State itself has taken previous action, it has excluded itself from the provisions of the measure, if it shall become law. It has removed itself from any of the effects of the joint resolution unless it is amended so as to contain provisions different from those we expect it to contain, because the measure, after all, merely provides for an extension of the present law.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Wisconsin remains correct. It is my understanding with reference to his sovereign State of Wisconsin that it removed itself, under the authority granted by the Federal statute, from Federal rent controls long since, and has well managed its own field of private property.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator does not know how pleasant it is, after having been engaged in an election campaign, to hear a Senator on the floor say, twice in the same day, that I am correct.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I am sure I shall be given many additional opportunities to make the same statement, if the Senator from Wisconsin should ask me more questions.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. My State of New Jersey, as I understand, and as the Senator's list confirms, did not actually decontrol in the manner in which the Senator has spoken of other States decontrolling.

Mr. CAIN. That is true.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. New Jersey has passed legislation which is supposed to take effect on the expiration of the present rent-control legislation on January 1. Therefore, if the Federal law is extended the new State law will come into effect at that time. We will be subject to immediate confusion if a new Federal law on the subject is passed. The question is whether New Jersey will not be better off under the present law than it would be under a new State law, with the possibility of returning in a short time to new Federal controls.

Mr. CAIN. It seems to me the Senator is taking as an assumption that Senate Joint Resolution 207 will be approved tomorrow by the Senate and, presumably, by the House, and that it will extend the present law for 2 months. Therefore, against that assumption, the Senator's own suggestion is that in his view New Jersey would be well advised not to initiate its own rent-control law until the expiration of the additional 60-day period.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Unless I am mistaken New Jersey has passed a law, which is to go into effect when the present law expires. In other words, the New Jersey law was passed to provide a stand-by. The State will put a new law into effect. But now New Jersey is puzzled. The question is whether we would not be well advised to vote for the extension of 2 months, and then study the problem for the future. I wanted the RECORD to show our peculiar local problem at the present time.

Mr. CAIN. It would be my conclusion, and the Senator from New Jersey will tell me if I am wrong, that the people of his State of New Jersey read carefully the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contained the debate on the subject of rent control 6 months ago. In view of the fact that the people of the State of New Jersey had been told by that RECORD and had found out by a reading of the law itself that the Federal law was going to expire on the 31st day of December 1950, unless any of the cities within New Jersey requested, through action by their city council, an extension of 6 months, the State of New Jersey preferred to say what it thought ought to be done, which was to develop and enact a rent-control law satisfactory to itself, which the State of New Jersey was prepared to initiate on the 1st day of January 1951. It would

be my view that the State of New Jersey would be well advised, sir, to take control of this private property regulatory question in its own hands, and the sooner it does so the better off the State of New Jersey will be.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The State of New Jersey might be subject to an over-all Federal control law which might be passed by reason of the war emergency. That is what I am speaking of. In other words, we could go on our own. But if by reason of the war emergency the Congress were to pass an over-all Federal control law, the State of New Jersey would be placed in a peculiar position.

Mr. CAIN. Neither the Senator from New Jersey nor I can judge accurately what the next Congress will do. I would hazard a guess, however, that the Congress of the United States would probably exclude from any Federal rent-control law to be written in the next session those States, and in some instances those cities, which are prepared to prove, as I would assume that New Jersey could, that those States or those cities are as well or better qualified to regulate and manage and administer a system of rent controls within their jurisdiction than is the Federal Government. Admittedly, sir, that is an assumption of what I should like to think would come to pass, because how much happier it is for all citizens, how much more effective it is for the rights of all people if we have a system closer to the people upon whom it is to be imposed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from Washington knows that was my position taken earlier this year.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thought it was time to come to the local level. But we are now presented with a problem which makes the matter confusing.

Mr. CAIN. We are. It is confusing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am obliged to go to a committee meeting. Did the Senator include Tennessee in his list of nine States?

Mr. CAIN. The State of Tennessee, sir, is not listed among the nine States. It is my understanding that some of the cities within Tennessee have been decontrolled within recent months, and other cities have requested an extension of 6 months.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure that while discussing this subject the Senator from Washington would be interested in a telegram I received this morning from Mr. Charles R. Moore, secretary of the Property Owners' Association of Pocatello, Idaho, which reads as follows:

POCATELLO, IDAHO, December 5, 1950.

Senator HENRY DWORSHAK,

Washington, D. C.:

Request you vote against extension of rent controls. Record in this city which has been decontrolled for several months indicates

they are not necessary. Controls have a detrimental effect on the construction of new rental units, create an artificial shortage of rentals. They also deter owners from making property improvements. Present low down payments for low-cost homes act as sufficient leverage to keep rents at proper level in this decontrolled area.

CHARLES R. MOORE,

Secretary, Property Owners Association.

Mr. CAIN. The telegram, I may say to the Senator from Idaho reminds me that the facts cannot be too often restated. America developed its first system of rent controls, as I recall, in about the year 1941, or the early part of 1942. In the years which have passed, despite a tremendous volume of private and public construction, America presently has some two-million-odd fewer units of rental housing than the Nation possessed when rent controls on the Federal level were first imposed. Whatever we do about rent controls in the future, we had better make up our minds that any law we may pass will result in providing additional rental space in which Americans can live, rather than taking away space which they had some years ago.

Scores of American cities have exercised the local-option provision which is a part of the law or have otherwise been decontrolled. I should like to mention only a few, in passing: Augusta, Ga.; Joplin, Mo.; Charlotte, N. C.; Tulsa, Okla.; Charleston, S. C.; Bellingham, Bremerton, Everett, Olympia, and Spokane, Wash.; Bloomington, Ind.; Miami, Fla.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Dallas, Tex.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Richmond, Va.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Birmingham, Ala.; and San Diego, Calif.

So far as I know, the experience of those cities under decontrol has been extraordinarily healthy and beneficial for all their residents and for the business in those communities. Again we should bear in mind that some of those cities have grown rapidly and have surrounding them all the problems which are referred to by the Office of the Housing Expediter in an attempt to frighten so many of us.

Since April 1949 an estimated 8,000,000 rental housing units have been removed from Federal control. If we pass Senate Joint Resolution 207, we veto the home-rule provisions which we fought so hard and so vigorously to make available to the very persons to whom we are inclined to say, tomorrow, "What we gave you but a few months ago we now are desirous of taking away from you."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WILEY. The last statement the Senator made provokes this inquiry: Assuming the Senator to be correct about the States which have removed themselves from Federal rent control by means of taking advantage of the provisions of the general statute, what effect will there be upon those States if this joint resolution is enacted?

Mr. CAIN. The enactment of the joint resolution will have no effect on them at all. The joint resolution, if enacted, simply will say to 1,600-odd

cities which presently are under Federal rent control, "You shall have taken away from you the right to determine whether you want Federal rent controls to continue in your cities from January 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951." The enactment of the joint resolution will have no force or effect or influence of any kind on any city or State which previously has been decontrolled or removed from Federal rent jurisdiction.

Mr. WILEY. If the respective States took action attempting to delegate that power to the cities within them, what effect would the enactment of this joint resolution have?

Mr. CAIN. If a State has the right to delegate some property-control authority to the cities within its confines, and if those cities have previously been decontrolled, the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 207 would have no effect.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Wisconsin is most welcome.

Mr. President, by the action which we may take tomorrow, we would compel 1,600 cities and towns who in their local judgment—and I think the cities of the United States of America have a great deal of wisdom—have said, "We do not wish to remain under the regulatory hand of the Federal Government or under Federal Government regulation."

Mr. President, if Congress meant what it said in April, 1949, in heaven's name let us not in December 1950 go back on that promise.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What was the promise just referred to by the distinguished Senator?

Mr. CAIN. The promise was that the right of self-determination concerning continuance of Federal rent control beyond December 13, 1950, should vest in the cities of America. We put every American city on due notice by saying to them, "Unless, by affirmative action, you say that you want 6 months' additional rent control on December 31, 1950, you will have been removed from Federal supervision in this field."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. How many cities availed themselves of the privilege referred to by the Senator, of determining whether or not they desired a continuance of Federal rent control?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Nebraska will probably be interested in learning that there are approximately 6,600 American cities with populations of 1,000 or more, and as of this moment, 2,400 of those 6,600 cities are under Federal rent control. Of the 2,400 cities now under control, 800 or more have already taken the necessary action locally to insure that they will have rent controls in their cities for a period of 6 months following January 1, 1951.

According to the determination I can make at the moment, 1,600 cities have not as yet taken any action. The guess

of the Senator from Nebraska is as good as mine as to how many of those 1,600 cities will, by proper action of their city councils taken between now and the last day of this year, say that they want an additional 6 months of rent control.

The important thing to bear in mind is that every American knows that what I am saying at the moment is a fact, namely, that after an examination of its own local problem, if it thinks it will require an additional 6 months of Federal rent control under the prevailing Federal statute, all it has to do is to request it. In the event Senate Joint Resolution 207 shall be passed by the Senate tomorrow, we shall have taken the position that we know more about the needs of approximately 1,600 cities, located in the various sections of the country, than do those who manage and control and rule those cities. I think such a premise is necessarily untenable, for it assumes that we know more than any one Senator in this room ought to claim credit for knowing, and it again deprives the American city of the right which is too often taken from it, to stand up and determine its own requirements and to shape its own destiny. To my mind it would be a grievous thing, a sad thing, for us, under the circumstances, to tell these 1,600 cities that we of the Congress do not care a whit what the cities think they need, or what they want to do, or what the cities are convinced is the best thing to be done, but that we in the Nation's Capital are going to do their thinking for them. It would be as though we said to them, "Just make up your minds that father knows best, and that father says you are no longer to enjoy the right of thinking for yourselves."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. To sum it up, then, as I understand the Senator's statement, more than 800 cities have already acted under the provisions of the Rent Control Act. Is that correct?

Mr. CAIN. They have acted affirmatively.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, those cities and municipalities have affirmatively determined to enforce rent controls, and therefore the pending measure would be of no particular use to them, because they have already obtained what they would be able to get under the resolution, through adopting rent controls in the local communities. Is that correct?

Mr. CAIN. The pending joint resolution has nothing whatever to do with those 800 cities.

Mr. WHERRY. It has to do only with 1,600 cities which now have the right, and which will continue to have the right until January 1, if the Rent Control Act is not extended, to adopt rent-control measures by action of the city councils, if deemed necessary.

Mr. CAIN. Those cities have had that right for the past 6 months.

Mr. WHERRY. And those cities, if they so decide, may continue to exercise that right after January 1, in the event they desire rent control, may they not?

Mr. CAIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska whether we ought not to assume that those who are

charged with the responsibility of handling these matters in the 1,600 cities are quite as conscious of the problems which confront the country as are we? Is it not logical to assume that they have examined a matter such as this, which so vitally affects their property? Is it not logical for us to assume that, if they find that they need Federal rent controls, they will request a 6 months' extension? If it is logical to make those assumptions, it would seem to the Senator from Washington that it is only logical that he should oppose passage of a measure which would deprive the American city of the right to think for itself.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am very much interested in getting answers to these questions. Does not the Senator feel that if the joint resolution were not passed, the result would be to possibly place an additional responsibility upon the 600 cities, if they needed rent control, of taking the necessary steps locally to obtain it, prior to January 1, 1951?

Mr. CAIN. I think it likely that most of the State legislatures will be in session during the early part of the year. Answering the Senator's question, I may say that I think the States and municipalities which cease to be under Federal rent control will either determine that they do not need rent control of any character, or, if they determine that they need it, they will effect the proper organization on a State and local level.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the situation with respect to the State legislatures. If Federal rent control terminates on December 31, then, of course the States may enact their own rent control measures.

Mr. CAIN. That is true.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask, is there anything in the proposed legislation in the way of provision relating to the time element or the procedure which would prevent a city from acting between now and January 1, 1951? Is it not true that any one of those 1,600 cities, if it desired, could adopt local rent control?

Mr. CAIN. To the best of my knowledge, that is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any procedural obstacle, is there any time element which might be involved?

Mr. CAIN. As I understand, the requirement is that, prior to the close of business on December 31, an American municipality now under rent control need only request of the Office of the Housing Expediter, in Washington, D. C., by affirmative action of its city council, a 6 months' extension, and it will be automatically granted.

Mr. WHERRY. Would that be true of the 1,600 cities?

Mr. CAIN. It would.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I have in mind.

Mr. CAIN. It is a very important point.

Mr. WHERRY. It is the point I want to make, that they would have that right.

Mr. CAIN. Indeed, they would.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator then thinks there is nothing in the provisions of the act, as presently interpreted, which would foreclose that right on the part of those cities, if they desired to exercise it. Is that correct?

Mr. CAIN. There is nothing that would preclude their exercise of that right, to the best of my knowledge. I may point out that the junior Senator from Washington comes from the city of Tacoma, a city having a population of approximately 140,000 people. Tacoma has not thus far, by action of its city council, requested a 6-months' extension of Federal rent control, nor has it adopted any resolution requesting decontrol. As of the time of my departure for Washington 2 weeks ago, the Tacoma city council was continuing its studies, in the light of new circumstances, to determine whether it desired to request an extension of Federal rent control. At that time, other cities had indicated conclusively that there was no need of an extension. If any changes occur in connection with the great Fort Lewis situation in the 2 weeks, it would follow that the city council of Tacoma could request a 6 months' extension. That would be within its legal right. If we pass the joint resolution tomorrow, we say to the city of Tacoma, "We care not how long you have been studying this question—we are going to make up your minds for you."

I desire to make one further observation, if the Senator will permit, without too much prejudice to the Office of the Housing Expediter. To my knowledge, there has been an effort within recent weeks to sell the subject of extending Federal rent control to cities throughout the land. Efforts are made to portray the dire consequences to cities which do not request the 6-months' extension of Federal rent control. The Office of the Housing Expediter is not quite satisfied with it. The Expediter does not think it permits his office to go far enough, and fear that the Office of the Housing Expediter may be unable to frighten some cities which, on the basis of their own study, know there is nothing about which they should be frightened. The Office of the Expediter desires the passage of the pending joint resolution, in order that it may capture in its net every one of the 1,600 cities.

We may allow the Office of the Housing Expediter to do this. It will be the business of every Senator to decide that question in voting tomorrow. But if we pass the joint resolution, it is my judgment that we shall have driven another nail into the coffin of home rule, responsibility, and sovereignty so far as the cities of America are concerned. I happen to be one Senator who is going to listen to a city council about any problem concerning which the council ought to know a great deal more than does the Senator from Washington. If the city of Tacoma wants 6 months' extension of Federal rent control, though I personally might dissent for economic reasons, as a Member of the United States Senate I say that is the business of the city of Tacoma. We gave to that city the right to make up its mind, and I, for

one, shall not vote tomorrow to take away that right.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Possibly the Senator may have discussed this point, but what argument does the Housing Expediter make, or do those who are in favor of extending rent control make, in contravention of the position just taken by the Senator from Washington? I should like a brief observation by the Senator. I do not want to burden him, but to allow him to take as much time as he wants.

Mr. CAIN. That is a very fair question, and I should like to answer it as best I can.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to know what the answer is.

Mr. CAIN. The proponents of the joint resolution, so far as I can understand from their arguments, say that it may be necessary to have a new, larger, and more rigorous Federal rent-control law, and therefore we should not permit the present law to expire on December 31, 1950, but should extend it for 60 days, so that the new Congress may have an opportunity to make up its mind as to what ought to be done. It is obvious that the rent-control law of the land will not expire on December 31, 1950. Now that 800 cities have requested an extension of 6 months, it is very logical to assume that other cities will have made such a request by December 31, 1950. We shall therefore continue to have a Federal rent-control law for 800 or more cities.

It would be my own judgment that if the United States faces a national emergency requiring a total mobilization of its resources and assets and manpower, it will probably be found that a Federal rent-control law will be required in the future. But I ought to make it clear that such a law must be a new piece of legislation, it must be a law in keeping with the requirements, not of 1941 or 1942, but in keeping with the requirements of 1951 and 1952. We are going to need a law—if we shall need any law—which will be completely dissimilar from the law we now have. The greatest favor I can think of granting to the new Congress, with particular reference to the Banking and Currency Committee, would be to afford it a full and free opportunity to take testimony, and to write and design a new law which would work without any further relationship or reference to the present rent-control law, which is outmoded and archaic and unfair, and which is not working, in thousands of instances, to bring simple, common justice to American citizens. I have endeavored to state the argument of the proponents, and I have stated my view of why I think it is not a valid argument.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to thank the Senator for his brief explanation, and for having given us his observations with respect to the argument of the proponents. I should, however, like to ask one more question. What are the mechanics? Let us assume that a city wished to take advantage of the oppor-

tunity to enforce local rent control. Let us assume that they indicated such a desire. What would it be necessary for the city to do? I have read the law, but I should like to know what the city would be required to do. In other words, could a city merely indicate that it wished to take advantage of the 6 months' extension, or would the city have to provide its own rent control?

Mr. CAIN. I shall answer the question of the Senator in part at this time, and I shall answer it in full as soon as I am able to do so. Only cities which are now under control may request an extension of 6 months beyond December 31.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the situation with reference to the 1,600 cities to which reference has been made?

Mr. CAIN. The 1,600 cities are those which are presently under control but which have not yet requested an extension of 6 months.

Mr. WHERRY. What must they do if they wish to have an extension of 6 months?

Mr. CAIN. That is provided for in the law, a copy of which I am endeavoring to obtain.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the answer lie in the pending joint resolution?

Mr. CAIN. No. I shall be glad to read from the law as soon as I have it before me. I am not completely familiar with the mechanics involved, but any city may by affirmative action of its city council pass an instrument—rarely an ordinance, and in most cases a resolution—which says in effect: "We, the city council, on this date have resolved that we want to extend Federal rent control for an additional 6 months." That instrument is certified and sent to the Office of the Housing Expediter. It is stamped "Approved," and that is all there is to it.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I wanted to know. Apparently the time element does not work against them. The procedure involved does not work against them. In other words, if the act is not extended tomorrow a city would have from now until January 1 to take such affirmative action?

Mr. CAIN. My understanding is that the Senator from Nebraska is precisely correct. However, I wish to say further that if we pass the joint resolution tomorrow, the next Congress will be confronted with the question: "What do we want to do about the law which is now on the books?" Therefore, Congress will be concerned with a law which has not worked and with the management of a law which is wholly suspect by practically every thinking person in America. It is interesting and unusual to note that the Office of the Housing Expediter is as badly thought of by the Committee for Industrial Organization as it is by the property owners of America. Everyone dislikes and has a minimum of respect for the Office of the Housing Expediter, although admittedly the reasons for such disrespect and dislike vary.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has stated that the proponents of the resolution which would extend rent control desire to continue the Rent Control Act for 60 days so that the next Congress will be able to provide a more rigorous and broadened Rent Control Act. If the need is acute and present next year—and it may be—would it not be as simple to submit a brand-new bill after the present act has expired in order to accomplish what the proponents of the joint resolution seek to accomplish by a continuance of the present act?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Nebraska and I could not possibly be more in agreement. If circumstances at the next session of Congress require a broadened and, let us say, total rent control law, it should be a new law. It should be written on the basis of the requirements and needs of that day. It should have no relationship or bear any semblance of relationship to a law which has been on the statute books for some years and which has never worked in a sound and equitable way. Although it has been fair enough to some people, it has been totally unfair to tens of thousands of other Americans. It seems to me that any law which Congress writes should provide justice to everyone.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. Before the Senator from Nebraska leaves the Chamber, I should like to read the following section of the present law, dealing with the steps which a city must take in order to obtain a 6 months' extension of the rent-control law:

SEC. 5. Section 204 (j) (3) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) The Housing Expediter shall terminate the provisions of this title in any incorporated city, town, village, or in the unincorporated area of any county upon receipt of a resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose in accordance with applicable local law and based upon a finding by such governing body reached as the result of a public hearing held after 10 days' notice, that there no longer exists such a shortage in rental housing accommodations as to require rent control in such city, town, village, or unincorporated area in such county—"

Mr. WHERRY. Does not that section refer to decontrol?

Mr. CAIN. Yes; I wanted to follow it immediately with the proviso with respect to the continuance of controls.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe it is on page 23.

Mr. CAIN. I have before me Public Law 574, Eighty-first Congress. The following section, when read in conjunction with the other section, provides a clear picture of the situation with respect to a city which either decontrols or continues controls:

SEC. 4. Section 204 (f) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) (1) The provisions of this title, except section 204 (a), shall cease to be in effect at the close of December 31, 1950, ex-

cept that they shall cease to be in effect at the close of June 30, 1951—

"(A) in any incorporated city, town, or village which, at a time when maximum rents under this title are in effect therein, and prior to December 31, 1950, declares (by resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popular referendum, in accordance with local law) that a shortage of rental housing accommodations exists which requires the continuance of rent control in such city, town, or village."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Yes; certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it under the latter provision that the 800 cities have continued rent control?

Mr. CAIN. Any city which desires an extension of 6 months is required simply to prepare an instrument, approved by its city council. That is the end of it. Eight hundred cities have taken action under that section. Sixteen hundred cities have the right to do it between now and the last day of this year.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe paragraph 2 answers my question. It reads:

(2) Any incorporated city, town, or village which makes the declaration specified in paragraph (1) (A) of this subsection shall notify the Housing Expediter in writing of such action promptly after it has been taken.

Mr. CAIN. That is what I have previously indicated. The only action a city is required to take is to notify the Housing Expediter in writing.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the machinery by which they may retain rent control?

Mr. CAIN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. No prohibition is in effect. They need not follow any particular procedure. All they need to do is have a meeting and authorize a continuance of rent control. By doing so the city comes under class A.

Mr. CAIN. There is one little provision in the law—I do not wish to call it a gimmick—which says that if a city wishes to decontrol under the local option clause of the law it must signify its intention to that effect by holding public hearings. However, if a city wishes to continue rent control all it is required to do is pass a simple resolution to that effect. Without being unduly critical, I know that, from a very serious anxiety and concern for the welfare of the American people, generally the Housing Expediter will, with considerable alacrity, help in transmitting his approval to any city which wants a continuation of Federal rent control.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be glad to yield if I am permitted to do so.

Mr. MALONE. I know that the junior Senator from Washington has made a very detailed study of this entire subject. Therefore, I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. Because of the lateness of the date and the convening of most State legislatures some time in January, would there be any reason, in the Senator's opinion, for extending the

opportunity to either escape or continue with rent control for a period of 30 days beyond the present expiration date?

Mr. CAIN. I can only say in all seriousness that from my point of view no sound purpose would be achieved if that suggestion were adopted. To repeat, I say that for the reason that Federal rent controls are not going to expire in America on the last day of this year.

Mr. MALONE. Except in the case of cities which have not taken action.

Mr. CAIN. Yes; but let us stay with that question a moment and see if we are not in agreement.

There are 2,400 American cities now under Federal rent control. Federal rent control will expire for all of those 2,400 cities which, by the close of business on December 31 of this year, have not requested an extension of 6 months. Eight hundred of the two thousand four hundred cities have already requested such an extension. Between now, the 6th day of December, and the last day of this year, a number of additional cities will have requested such extension. For the first 6 months of next year there will be just as much Federal rent control for those cities which have requested an extension as there is today. The Congress of the United States put the cities of America on notice fully 6 months ago that they could either decontrol themselves or request an extension. I think the question which the Senator raises is not valid, because to extend the law for any period of time beyond December 31, 1950, would simply in substance be saying to all the cities, "We gave you the right to make up your minds, and now we have concluded that you do not know how to make up your minds, so we of the Congress, who know best, are going to do your thinking for you." That is the fundamental basis of my argument against extension.

Mr. MALONE. The distinguished junior Senator from Washington is fully aware of the strong position which the junior Senator from Nevada has often taken, namely that local control is far better than congressional control two or three thousand miles away, and should be protected at all times.

Mr. CAIN. I am conscious of that.

Mr. MALONE. Will the junior Senator from Washington explain why his amendment to the joint resolution, submitted on December 5, would be necessary, provided the joint resolution were to pass? In other words, is there some misunderstanding of the law with respect to resolutions of a governing body or an official body, so that it is necessary in some manner to legalize the decisions of some areas?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to answer that question. However, it is a very long story. I shall answer as briefly as I can.

As the result of an appeal by some interested parties in Los Angeles, Calif., taken to the circuit court of appeals, the circuit court recently ruled that in its opinion the Congress meant, when it wrote this local-option provision, that a community could either request extension or take decontrol action only through a city ordinance, and not

through a resolution. Obviously, any judge has the right to make any decision he deems proper.

The dilemma which now faces us, and because of which I submitted an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 207 yesterday, is that if the Supreme Court of the United States upholds the circuit court of appeals' decision, it means that the action taken by 800 American cities through resolutions to extend rent controls for 6 months into 1951 will be invalid, that comparable resolutions resulting in decontrol of rents in scores of American cities will likewise be invalid, and that all the parties at issue, both property owners and tenants, must have recourse to the courts of the land. The single purpose of the amendment of yesterday was to validate all of the city actions taken in the past, either for extension or decontrol.

Mr. MALONE. Regardless of whether or not it was done by city ordinance or by resolution.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada favored the first extension, containing the local option provision relating to the action of cities, counties, or other subdivisions decontrolling by resolution, but with the approval of the Governor of the State. In some of the States, including my own State of Nevada, it was found that the Governor refused to approve several of the resolutions. Therefore the next time rent control was extended the junior Senator from Nevada was heartily in favor of taking the Governor out of the play entirely and leaving it entirely to the local areas, because, as the distinguished junior Senator from Washington has so ably explained—and that is also the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada—no one understands a local situation as well as does a city council, and the people who live in the particular city or area. Therefore it is the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada that such a local option provision was very fair.

Mr. CAIN. Six months ago the Congress and the President agreed with the view just announced by the junior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. That is true. As I understand, it is the opinion of the junior Senator from Washington that ample time has been given, and that there is nothing between now and January 1 to prevent any city which has not already requested extension, or to be relieved of all regulations, to take the proper action through resolution, which I understand the junior Senator from Washington to say he believes was the intention of Congress in the first place. In other words, it was the intention that it could be done merely by a resolution.

Mr. CAIN. I think it was the intention of the Congress, including the very distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and other members of his committee, both Republicans and Democrats, as well as Members of the Senate generally, and

Members of the House of Representatives, that the intention of the Congress—and the President signed his name to the measure—was to permit the cities of America, by any legal means within their authority, to decontrol or to ask for an extension.

Mr. MAYBANK rose.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like very much to have the explanation of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

If I may add a further point, it is often almost impossible even for a city council to pass an ordinance in a short time, because there are certain technicalities which must be complied with, whereas a resolution is a different thing. I should like very much to hear the explanation of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee on that point.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield, I shall be glad to comment.

Mr. CAIN. I shall be grateful to the Senator from South Carolina for his comments.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am fully aware of the fact that 2 days after the President signed his name to the bill war broke out in Korea. Conditions today are entirely different from what they were last year when we passed the bill. I made the statement that I did not think the present Congress should consider a new rent-control bill, because it would not have time to write a proper bill. I believe that a rent-control bill should be written in keeping with the all-over control act, which has not been sufficiently used, to my way of thinking. Nevertheless, we have not the time in this Congress to write a new rent-control bill.

I do not believe that the present Congress should undertake, within the short time remaining in this session, to write permanent legislation, in view of the fact that the next Congress will meet in January. It was for that reason that I suggested an extension under States' rights and under city rights to continue for 2 months, which would give some cities an opportunity to continue rent control for 6 months under the present law.

The distinguished Senator from Washington has been addressing a group of mayors on the subject of the decision of the circuit court of appeals. He and I are both former mayors. For many years both of us belonged to the United States Conference of Mayors. I happened to hold a small office in that organization at one time. The executive director of the Conference of Mayors has written me as follows:

The decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit on November 24 last has thrown the whole rent control situation into confusion. In spite of the patently clear provisions of the bill passed earlier this year the Court's decision in effect holds that all resolutions adopted by city councils in accordance with local law (for either decontrol or continuation up to June 30 next) are invalid. The court held only ordinances were legal.

Because of the very great possibility that the United States Supreme Court cannot act on the appeal before December 31 it would seem that the only way the situation could be met would be to add a proviso to Senate Joint Resolution 207 which is now before the Senate. I would most strongly urge that the resolution be amended in line with the attached memo in order to take care of this legal situation in which the cities find themselves as a result of the court of appeals' decision.

With best wishes always, I am,

Yours sincerely,

PAUL V. BETTERS,  
Executive Director.

Mr. Betters was one of those who testified, as my good friend from Washington knows. I had intended to mention this memorandum, if the Senator from Washington did not do so. As a matter of fact, I believe the Senator from Washington attended the meeting of the Conference of Mayors on the morning of the day I happened to meet with some of them in the afternoon.

I understand that the Senator from Washington is not for the joint resolution, even with the amendment. I have not studied the details of the amendment, but I am having it studied now. I intend to accept some amendment which would protect the municipalities of this country. At one time I had the honor to be a member of the Conference of Mayors.

Mr. CAIN. The intention of the amendment which I submitted yesterday to Senate Joint Resolution 207 is merely to validate all the actions in the form of resolutions taken by the cities, for or against control.

Mr. MAYBANK. I talked with the Senator before he went to speak to the mayors.

Mr. CAIN. I understand that the committee staff is not only sympathetic toward the amendment, but hopes to be able to recommend its inclusion in the joint resolution.

Mr. MAYBANK. I know that something of the sort must be included, because of the possibility of the Supreme Court not acting. I certainly intend to accept the Senator's amendment, or to work out something jointly. I would not commit myself as to the exact wording. I wanted to have that matter made perfectly clear.

I further wish to say to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] that the joint resolution simply provides for an extension of 2 months. We have no bill dealing with the subject. However, if the war situation does not become better in another year—which we all hope and pray it will—we shall be obliged to deal with the matter. Let us deal with it then in connection with a defense bill, in connection with a bill having to do with the Military Establishment.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I know that courts often consider the intent of Congress if the intent is clear. I understand from the distinguished Senator from Washington that he believes, as does the junior Senator from Nevada, that the intent of Congress was that a resolution of a city council would be sufficient.

Mr. CAIN. It would be my consideration that there would be no one in this body who would dissent from that view.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator asked me the same question, and I will say that that was the view held by the committee.

Mr. CAIN. And testimony to that effect was offered in the hearing before the committee held the other day.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. I shall proceed as rapidly as possible, sir, to answer questions as best I can, as I am always interested in the field of property management and the rights which belong to American citizens.

Now, Mr. President, let us examine the justification for Senate Joint Resolution 207, as advanced by its proponents—as found in the committee report. Bear in mind always that in our discussion of this proposed legislation we are concerning ourselves only with 1,600 cities out of a national total of 6,600 American cities whose population exceeds 1,000.

The report states "In many of these same areas"—meaning these 1,600 cities—"it has been and will continue to be necessary to house many more people due to an increase in defense production or activation of military establishments after December 31, 1950."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may make one more observation?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to say for the benefit of the Senator from Nevada that the joint resolution, if passed, would take away no rights from the communities or the cities which we have previously extended. It is our intention to leave the same provisions in it as are contained in the law, so any cities can, by their own action, decontrol.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, with all due deference to my colleague, I would have to take positive exception to what he has just said, for, in my opinion anyway, I hold that the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 207 takes away the most important right of all which had previously been given to the American cities, namely, the right of self-determination. The law of the land as it now stands, and as it was passed about 6 months ago, said to any American city of some 2,400 cities: "Between now and the 31st day of December 1950 you shall be given a choice to determine whether you want to request an extension of controls for 6 months, or if you do not, the law, inasmuch as it affects you, will expire on the 31st day of December 1950." The passage of the joint resolution tomorrow will say to these 1,600 cities now under control, but which have not requested another 6 months' extension, "We meant no such thing."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield, because that is the hub around which the whole argument now revolves.

Mr. MAYBANK. The extension of 2 months merely means that cities which

had intended to take the action to decontrol would have two months more in which to do it. The Senator will agree with me on that point, will he not?

Mr. CAIN. No. I should like first to ask the Senator what he means by saying that the passage of the joint resolution would say to those American cities which have not had an opportunity to decontrol that there will be an extension of 2 months within which they can do so.

Mr. MAYBANK. They will have the opportunity then to extend control for 6 months, or decontrol, whichever they wish to do.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator will permit me to point out that it is my opinion that the cities have had 5 months to make up their minds.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. They still have the time between the 6th day of December and the 31st day of December to determine whether they want 6 months more.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CAIN. And the joint resolution, if it shall be passed tomorrow, will say to all cities, "You are not going to be given the choice of self-determination." Now that is what we really are talking about.

Mr. MAYBANK. No, because they will be given a choice of self-determination, if they do not use it for a period of two additional months. No change is made in the law. They are simply given 2 months more.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. If the distinguished Senator from Washington would allow me, perhaps this statement might clarify the situation. In the case of cities which have taken no action to extend their controls, because they think they are out from under controls automatically on the 1st of January, the adoption of the joint resolution tomorrow would automatically make it necessary for them to take decontrol action to get out from under, or else continue with control.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator could not be more right.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct. That is what I said.

Mr. CAIN. That is for continuing control action, not decontrol.

Mr. MALONE. The holidays are near. That is the reason the junior Senator from Nevada asked the junior Senator from Washington whether, in his opinion, the time was adequate, and it was not necessary to extend the time. I still believe that many of the 1,600 cities that have not taken such action will think that it is best to let sleeping dogs lie, and get out from under control on January 1.

Mr. CAIN. There is now in conference the American Municipal Association. It consists of hundreds of mayors, scores of whom are now in Washington, D. C. A good many of those mayors have told me that their city councils have not yet taken action to decontrol their cities; that they do not have any intention of taking such ac-

tion, nor do they have any intention of requesting an additional 6 months. The cities which those mayors represent have relied upon the law of the land, which says with reference to a particular city, "If it was your wish neither to take action to decontrol yourself nor to take action to extend controls for 6 months, you would be out from under controls on the 31st of December 1950.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. It is possible that many of the 1,600 cities are counting automatically on being decontrolled.

Mr. CAIN. I do not know to what extent that is true, but I happen to be closely associated with a great number of these mayors, and many of them have told me that is identical with their own situation. They have relied on the law to run its own course.

Mr. MALONE. They have relied on the word of Congress that the law would expire on December 31, 1950.

Mr. CAIN. It is an important and interesting question any way one looks at it.

Mr. President, we have been fighting a war in Korea for more than 5 months. Certainly the existence of that war has been impressed on the minds of all Americans. I would take for granted that most American cities have given serious consideration to whether in their considered opinion additional Federal rent controls are required for their needs. It seems to me that we must give the benefit of the doubt to every city and assume that if it has not asked for an extension of 6 months, it knew what it was doing, and that city does not require any additional extension of control.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I might call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Washington the fact that the President has not yet said we are at war. He has said that this is a police action.

Mr. CAIN. Certainly, I would not argue at the moment with a man who must be sorely distressed by so many difficult problems as is the President today. But I would say that I and a good many other Americans understand and know what war is, and from the minute the first bullet was fired, particularly under the circumstances in which the first bullet was fired in Korea headed north, we Americans had a right to assume that it was the beginning of a larger war; but it was war with all its bloodshed and tragedy from the very minute the aggressor crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, and the determination of the United Nations was to drive the aggressor back from where he came.

Mr. MALONE. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Washington that the junior Senator from Nevada thoroughly agrees with the conclusions of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. In my opinion it would be extremely good for the American people to understand the real situation, and

I suppose they can only if they are told by the Chief Executive of the country that we are at war, and should settle down, fight it out, economically, socially, politically, and militarily, and win the war which has surrounded us on all sides and been a part of us since the 26th day of June, 1950.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I see that even the Department of Commerce realizes there is now an emergency in existence. They have at last, at this late date, ordered that shipments of steel and rubber and munitions to Communist China be stopped.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington wishes it was neither a war nor an emergency. But it is both.

To continue, Mr. President, the report further states that employers are experiencing difficulty in recruiting and retaining in-migrant workers due to the inability of the new workers to find housing, and that commanding officers are expressing concern over the inability of military personnel to obtain housing.

That language, if I understand it, states that there is presumed to be, or that there may in the future be, a shortage of shelter in some 1,600 communities. If a housing shortage can be proven in any or all of these 1,600 cities, I defy any Senator or any other thinking person to prove that we can cure the shortage and create badly needed and immediate housing production by further imposing Federal rent control on that city. If I thought Federal rent control would produce any housing, I certainly would be in favor of it. If housing is imperatively needed in any industrial area or adjacent to any military establishment, why do we not do something about it, really? We shall not be doing anything about it by the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 207. If housing is imperatively needed in an industrial area or near a military establishment, let the Executive agencies accelerate and put back into motion all of the present legislation which has as its purpose aid to housing production, both private and public. Is there anything wrong with that?

Rent controls are generally thought to be a means of getting more housing units in which persons may live. When rent control does no such thing, let us look for a piece of machinery which will accomplish the purpose which all of us have in mind. Let this or the new Congress enact the necessary legislation which will provide and assist in the immediate construction of emergency housing, whether it be of the Lanham Act type, trailers, prefabricated units, barracks type, or Quonset huts. Passage of Senate Joint Resolution 207 will not produce or create any immediately needed housing. On the contrary, a continuing imposition of Federal rent regulation will have the effect of further reducing the existing inventory of rental facilities. The junior Senator from Washington has stated many times before, and his statement has never been

challenged, that since the imposition of Federal rent control, over 2,000,000 rental units have disappeared from the rental market through sale, conversion, or voluntary withdrawal.

In further justification of Senate Joint Resolution 207, the proponents assert—and I read from the report:

If those units—

Meaning the 4,000,000 units previously referred to—

were now thrown onto an uncontrolled market, in view of the growing impact of the national preparedness program, excessive increases in rent would be entirely likely.

I vigorously dissent from that statement and all that it implies, but I shall not labor my dissent at this time.

Let me concede the statement to be correct for the purpose of this discussion of Senate Joint Resolution 207. How can we justify the imposition of a Federal law, a national law, on only 1,600 American cities who by their actions have clearly stated they do not wish the legislation? I assert that this proposed Federal law is not needed, for there are existing and time-proven constructive alternatives. New York State, with its locally designed regulation, is but one. It is locally administered, and assertions have been made by responsible citizens of that State that under no circumstances would they wish their present regulations replaced by Federal rent control.

State legislatures all over the Nation convene early in 1951. Those sovereign States should measure up to their responsibility and should take from the Federal Government this police power, for our National Government has before it in the days ahead far more important duties and obligations to its citizens.

But there are other workable alternatives to Senate Joint Resolution 207 which are operating and can be applied to regulate and control excessive rent increases. I shall give you in detail two of them.

First, I cite the example of a city immediately adjacent to a large Army post, and how the rental problems of servicemen and their families are being very satisfactorily resolved.

Mr. President, I am distressed that the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is not in the Senate Chamber at the moment, because this first example relates to a city which is situated in his State.

Fort Jackson is 4 miles distant from Columbia, S. C., a city with a 1950 population of 90,000. Just prior to World War II, Fort Jackson was reactivated, in 1940. There was immediately indicated a trend toward a tight rental housing market. The Columbia Chamber of Commerce set up conferences between General Peyton, the post commanding officer, his staff, and the property owners' group, out of which the following plan was evolved and put into operation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the plan, as it was designed and worked in South Carolina, be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McMAHON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Chair.

The matter referred to is as follows:

1. The fort would establish a billeting office in the city, and would maintain an active list of available rentals voluntarily submitted by owners or agents.

2. A fair rents committee, composed of three (3) real estate agents and three (3) from the staff of Fort Jackson, with a representative from the chamber of commerce, was established with the following duties:

(a) Review any allegedly improper rental submitted by either landlord or tenant, or prospective landlord or tenant; after which, an analysis was made, from which a determination of fair rental was reached.

(b) If the landlord failed to acquiesce to the determination by the fair rents committee, the billeting officer was instructed to remove such property from the eligible list for occupancy by military personnel.

Only three (3) cases of any consequence arose, with solutions reached within ten (10) days. This resulted in holding the rent line on a voluntary basis and the property ownerships, generally, cooperated fully.

Fort Jackson was ordered to be deactivated about April 1949, shortly after the Military had urged upon the citizenry the importance of constructing 3,150 units for military personnel, with the implied threat that, if the citizens did not do so, the Government would. The citizens there put their shoulders to the wheel and in a remarkably short time initiated the construction of a substantial portion of the requested housing units.

When the Korean situation developed, the reactivation of Fort Jackson was ordered. Despite existing vacancies, the realtors and the chamber of commerce invited the Fort Jackson authorities to a housing conference. The result was the re-establishment of a rental committee, as above outlined, with a further guide for fair rental. This was to be a net 6 percent return to the property owner, based on current replacement costs as of the date of review, less applicable depreciation. All expenses allowable under income tax law were to be taken into consideration in determining the net income. Fort Jackson now has approximately 30,000 on the Post and there has not been one single complaint for their committee to handle.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I now give an example of a highly industrialized American city where, since 1942, the rental housing problem has been completely and satisfactorily handled at the local municipal level with no Federal intervention, or at Federal expense.

Flint, Mich., a city whose 1950 population is approximately 163,000, and in which area employment is at an all-time high—114,500—has never been under Federal rent control although it is situated in a defense rental area as designated under the original OPA Rent Control Act.

Mr. President, I think this story about Flint, Mich., will be of interest to many of the Members of this body. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of my remarks at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Prior to OPA, the mayor of Flint had appointed a fair-rent committee which functioned properly and fairly, holding hearings, if requested, with both the landlord and

tenant present and decisions were made. However, the committee had no power to enforce its rulings. On July 1, 1942, the OPA appointed a local rent administrator. A committee from the Genessee County Real Estate Board contacted the local civilian defense council and jointly wired a protest to Washington, based upon the OPA ruling that local conditions must warrant the appointment. OPA withdrew the appointment subject to further investigation. The fair-rent committee then proposed an ordinance covering rent control, following the Federal act except for registration and enforcement. The power of enforcement was given the municipal judges who were to be aided by the city attorney's office and free appraisals were to be made by the real-estate board. This ordinance became effective November 15, 1942. However, on November 10, OPA announced that an administrator's office would be opened in Flint on December 1, and on November 11 about 100 wires and letters were sent to Washington and Cleveland OPA offices, to their Congressmen, Senators, the Governor, and others, protesting that the situation did not warrant the appointment. Also, a four-page letter was sent to the President explaining the situation. This letter was signed by the city attorney, the taxpayers association, the Flint Council for Defense, chamber of commerce, CIO regional office, county CIO office, A. F. of L. Regional office, and the real-estate board.

OPA again withdrew the appointment and the local rent-control ordinance went into effect. While the ordinance followed the Federal policy, there were several differences. It was not necessary for landlords to register their dwellings and violations are enforced by municipal judges.

The workings of the ordinance are very simple. In the event that the landlord feels that he is entitled to an increase in rent, or a tenant feels that he is entitled to a decrease, they file a bill with the city clerk and an appraiser is sent out to investigate the property and a hearing is held before a municipal judge on the following Monday. All parties interested are allowed to voice any comments they may have and the appraiser expresses his opinion as to what the rent should have been as of March 1, 1942, the freeze date. It is then up to the municipal judge to set the rent upon what he thinks is a fair rent as of the freeze date.

There have been over 3,000 adjustments made since the ordinance went into effect.

At the time OPA decided to take Flint over in 1942, their own estimate for operation of OPA in Flint was \$125,000 a year. It is easy to understand that this estimate today would be considerably higher. If the figure is right, \$125,000 a year for 8 years would be \$1,000,000. It appears to me that the savings of a million dollars in a city the size of Flint is commendable, for it is staggering to think of what the cost of administering rent control over the Nation has been.

Mr. CAIN. No, Mr. President, the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 207 cannot be justified by the words and predictions of the prophets of gloom and chaos who forever have insisted that rents will rise exclusively, that mass evictions will take place, and have even predicted riot and bloodshed, for none of these have happened in those cities and communities in which 8,000,000 units have been removed from Federal rent control. We have shown that if there be among these 1,600 cities a need for controls that need can be met through legislation by their parent States, their local governing bodies, or by voluntary cooperation between the parties at in-

terest. These are the proven and tested alternatives to an extension of the present law. These American communities should be permitted and encouraged to allow their citizens the rights inherent in the ownership and management of private property. If the conduct of that management needs regulation, let it be done at their local level of government. We should not compel their continuing acceptance of Federal control when by their actions they have so clearly indicated their choice, which we, the Congress, gave to them in April 1949.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington has confined this statement to the need or the lack of need of Senate Joint Resolution 207. We are not this afternoon debating a Federal rent-control bill. We are not arguing the merits or demerits of Federal property management.

We are not discussing the plight of property owners or the protection that should be afforded tenants. Those discussions and that legislation may likely come before the Eighty-second Congress. If and when full all-out mobilization comes, when the many powers given the Executive under the Production Act of 1950 may become operative, then we shall design a totally new regulatory statute applicable to rental housing, a statute which will be based upon and will reflect the economic facts of life as found in the year of 1951. Let us be done now and forever with any further extension of any part of that wartime emergency OPA statute of 1942, which, despite every effort of well-intentioned, very serious, energetic, and intelligent Members of succeeding Congresses to rewrite, amend, or adjust it, remains on our statute books today a travesty on our American spirit of fair play and equal justice.

It is my considered judgment that, certainly in my 4 years in the Senate, no statute has ever been so stupidly interpreted by those in the executive branch charged with its conduct. That conduct has been shot through with prejudice, with malice, and to some extent, I think, with dishonesty. The intent and wish of the Congress have been flagrantly violated by the Administrator of the Office of the Housing Expediter and by his staff. Administrative rules and regulations have been willfully designed to thwart many provisions of the law over which the Members of Congress—both Democrats and Republicans—labored long in their effort to provide some measure of relief and justice to American citizens. No, Mr. President, let us not inflict this miserable administration of a poor public law on these 1,600 cities beyond the 31st day of December, 1950.

Those cities have had the right, and until December 31 still have the right, as I read the law, to ask for and receive continuing Federal rent control. Perhaps all of the 1,600 cities will ask, between now and the end of the year, an additional 6 months of Federal rent controls, if that be their wish. That is not likely, of course, but the law gives every one of those 1,600 cities the right to do so. We cannot justify an insistence that these American communities accept what they so clearly indicate they simply

do not want. Passage of Senate Joint Resolution 207 compels that acceptance.

Mr. President, under date of December 2, 1950, I received a provocative letter from a Mr. John Cotton, who writes to me from the city of San Diego, Calif., to give his version of what happened in that large California city following decontrol. I ask unanimous consent that his letter be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., December 2, 1950.  
HON. HARRY CAIN,  
United States Senator,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Rent decontrol in San Diego has presented no serious problem in the 3 months since the Expediter complied with the city council's resolution.

During the period following the city council's action, but before decontrol was effective, the rent director charged he was receiving dozens of complaints daily of exorbitant rent increases. These calls were, however, presumed to have been largely telephone contacts; many may have been unconfirmed; many may have been crank calls.

The fact of the matter is that there has not been a single case of rent raise here which has warranted a news story in the San Diego newspapers. The only newspaper publicity unfavorable to landlords has been in occasional letters to the editor and several of these letters appear to have been written by the same individual. All have been general, with no citation of any specific increase.

Our office manages some 700 units which were decontrolled on September 1. We served notices on that day upon 555 tenants of increases to be effective October 1. The average increase was 14 percent. In dollars, it was \$5.14, raising the average monthly rent from \$36.58 to \$41.72.

The fact that tenants had a satisfactory alternate to paying a rent which they thought too high was clearly demonstrated in the instance of an 8-unit bungalow court property at 1525-37 Union Street—partially furnished cottages with living-bedroom combination, kitchen and bath; fairly modern; right down town.

At this property, we had planned an increase from \$34.50 per month to \$42.50, with no immediate expenditure for furnishings or improvements, and we notified the tenants this would be their rent.

During the 30-day notice period, six of the tenants moved. We are advised five rented other quarters and one bought a home. We then spent \$50 to \$100 per unit in additional furniture and rented the vacancies for \$42.50 each.

It has been our experience in reviewing our own increases and the increases of other landlords that the average raise here has been less than the 30 percent which the Housing Expediter was allowing just before our decontrol. Many have not raised their rents at all—in this office we left the rents alone on about 145 units—many owners are making substantial expenditures on their properties to improve their value.

Another unusual example of the availability of housing here was demonstrated just this week. We took over the operation of a downtown apartment and hotel property as of December 1. This building is largely tenanted by families with children at rents of \$10 to \$12 weekly for two- and three-room apartments. Less than a week before we were to take over, someone maliciously circulated a rumor that the new management would evict all tenants with children. When we took over yesterday, we found 6

apartments out of 22 had been vacated. It was that easy for 6 tenants with children to go out in a few days and find another place, without even bothering whether this rumor were false—as it was.

It is well known that this defense area is enjoying a steady influx of population through the stepping up of aircraft plant activity and the military. While there have been no authoritative predictions as to the rate of our population growth since the beginning of Korea, an increased housing shortage which might have been presumed to result from this influx is apparently being prevented by the high rate of residential construction. New housing is being constructed in the city of San Diego at the rate of 270 to 628 per month for the last 6 months (average 448); and in the county outside the various incorporated cities at the rate of from 234 to 426 (average 321). This does not even include the new housing in the smaller cities in the county.

In talking a few days ago with the head of the housing office of a large aircraft plant here which solicits housing for its employees, I was informed that their office had an average of nine requests for rental housing per day over a 4-day period 1 month ago, which appeared to be typical. During this same period they received an average of 27 private rental listings per day and placed an average of 5 tenants per day for sure, with a probability that more accepted housing units to which they were referred without reporting back to the housing office. The placements does not include tenants placed in Federal war housing, which would account for 3 more per day during this period. The rents requested on private listings received by the plant on the day of my interview ranged from \$25 to \$90 per month, with an average of \$61.70 per month.

In closing may I say that the effect of the international situation on San Diego does not appear to create a situation which would require any rent control here. I believe further that the position of the aircraft plants here as to housing for their immigrant workers could be immediately improved by making two simple changes in the operation of the Lanham Act (war housing) housing projects here. First a general increase in rents to a realistic figure which would force out thousands of tenants who only stay in Federal housing because it is such a bargain; secondly, the granting of the authority with instructions to act to the PHA to evict tenants who are not in defense production, so as to provide this housing specifically for that purpose.

Trusting this may be of some interest, I am sincerely,

JOHN COTTON.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have also recently received an article entitled "Flint Meets Rent-Control Problem Without Federal Aid," by Merle Oliver. The article was published in the Detroit News for November 12, 1950. In the article Mr. Oliver concludes that Flint, Mich., has met the rent-control problem without Federal aid. I should like to draw Mr. Oliver's conclusions and the article on this subject to the attention of my colleagues; for that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the article be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLINT MEETS RENT-CONTROL PROBLEM  
WITHOUT FEDERAL AID  
(By Merle Oliver)

FLINT, MICH., November 11.—An extraordinary coalition of real estate operators,

union leaders, landlords, tenants, and city officials has put Flint in a class by itself when it comes to rent control. It has saved the Federal Government an estimated \$1,000,000,000 in 8 years.

When Federal rent controls were set up in 1942, a plan was devised here to keep the bureaucrats out of Flint.

Everybody agreed that control was unavoidable but wanted it handled by hometown people. So the city set up its own rent-control ordinance and persuaded the Washington OPA people to stay away.

Rents were frozen at the March 1, 1942, level as in cities under Federal rent control. Landlords and tenants have the right to apply to municipal court for adjustments.

#### LANDLORDS JAILED

Hearings are held, and if the judge decides that the rent is too low or too high, he grants an increase or decrease. Members of the Genesee County real estate board serve as investigators and witnesses.

In cases of overcharge, tenants can sue and recover up to treble damages. There is also a penalty of 90 days in jail or \$100 fine for flagrant cases. Municipal Judge Frank W. Cain sent two landlords to jail for shutting off a tenant's heat.

There has been one blanket increase in rents. In 1946 the city council allowed a 10-percent increase for unheated units and 15 percent for heated apartments. There has been no other application for a general increase.

The ordinance written by former City Attorney Walter C. Krapohl, covers furnished living quarters and hotels as well as unfurnished units.

#### HOUSES FOR RENT

"Some instances of chiseling have been uncovered," Judge Cain said. "We still hear two or three cases a week. Apparently the ordinance has been generally satisfactory."

Employment in the area is at an all-time high of 114,500. The average weekly wage here for factory workers is \$79.17, compared with \$74.90 in Wayne County.

Nevertheless, places for rent still are available, Judge Cain said. An average two-bedroom home rents for about \$25 or \$30 a month.

John W. Davis, realtor, who is chairman of the rent investigating committee of the Genesee County real estate board, said that many landlords have taken advantage of loopholes in the ordinance, "but the result usually is to even up unfairness of the law."

Real estate taxes jumped 50 percent here last year with the removal of mill-tax limitations.

#### OWNERS INCREASE

"All the big operators have left the real estate rental business," Davis said. "They sold out years ago. No rent units have been built. About the only landlords are owners of one or two houses who are hanging on hoping for decontrol and people who own two-unit dwellings."

"Landlords have sold at attractive prices. A house that brings \$25 or \$30 a month rent can be sold for \$6,000, with \$1,000 down and \$55 a month for the next 11 years, with 6-percent interest. It would take more than twice as long to get the same amount in rent."

Occupant ownership of dwellings in Flint is above 70 percent, compared with 50 percent in 1942.

"During those 8 years, many tenants have become landlords, and these former tenants now holler the loudest that rents are too low," Davis said.

#### OWNER LOSES HOUSE

Raymond French, assistant city attorney, who handles rent control, said there have been numerous complaints about the ordinance, because every case has a dissatisfied

loser. However, nobody has appealed a decision to circuit court, not even the landlord who lost a house to a tenant in treble damages and owed still more.

Donnel Chapman, regional director for the UAW-CIO said local rent control in general has been a good thing for the city. When the Marvel-Schebler Carburetor Co. moved to Peoria, Ill., recently, all its employees here were offered jobs at the new location with continued seniority.

"They investigated Peoria housing conditions and came back to Flint," Chapman said.

#### PLAN BRINGS PROFIT

Davis said that Federal rent control in Flint for the last 8 years would have cost an estimated \$1,000,000. Local control brought a net profit of \$100 for the period.

Whether local rent control is continued probably will depend on what happens in the rest of the country.

"People here believe that extension of Federal rent control is inevitable," Davis said. "There is no move to repeal the local ordinance, because landlords and tenants alike prefer to run our own business and keep the bureaucrats out."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### GOVERNMENT PURCHASES OF WOOL

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Government To Buy 100,000,000 Pounds of Wool on Open Market." The article appears in the Wall Street Journal for Tuesday, November 29.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### GOVERNMENT TO BUY 100,000,000 POUNDS OF WOOL ON OPEN MARKET

WASHINGTON.—The Government announced it will contract in the open market for a maximum of 100,000,000 pounds of wool by next June 30 to meet emergency reserve requirements.

A five-nation conference at Melbourne, Australia, has turned down a proposal to set aside a portion of the Australian wool to meet United States emergency needs, the State Department announcement said. Such a system of preemption was turned down as impracticable, the statement said.

As a result of the Melbourne decision, the Department said that of the estimated total United States need, 30,000,000 pounds will be bought by the Commodity Credit Corporation from American merchants for processing into military clothing.

The balance will be obtained through ordinary trade channels as required by successful contractors.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in this article it is stated that the Government announced that to meet emergency requirements and for stockpiling purposes, it would purchase 100,000,000 pounds of wool in the open market by next June 30. On the same date, when the article was written, it is noted that fine wool, as quoted on the commodity markets, sold at \$2.55 a pound, or \$1.06 a pound higher than the same grade was selling for on January 1, 1950. The major portion of that increase has taken place since the outbreak of the war in Korea. For the benefit of the American taxpayers who will pay for this stockpiling program, I think it might be well to review the record of the Government's activities in wool during the past months.

First, I call particular attention to the fact that this stockpiling of strategic materials was authorized by the Congress on July 23, 1946, but it was only last week that the Government, with its inventory of wool practically zero, finally decided that wool was an essential commodity.

The Government's inventories of wool for the past 4 years have been as follows:

	Pounds
June 30, 1947.....	424,659,861
June 30, 1948.....	166,653,936
June 30, 1949.....	96,020,242
June 30, 1950.....	454,752

Notwithstanding our stockpiling program which has been in effect during the past 3½ years, we find that these once huge inventories of wool have been declared surplus and disposed of at a loss to the American taxpayers of \$44,030,347.79. Eleven million two hundred fifteen thousand nine hundred forty-two dollars and forty-nine cents of this loss was sustained on the 96,000,000 pounds which were disposed of during the 12-month period immediately preceding the outbreak of war in Korea, with the final sales of this liquidation program being reported on July 1, 1950, 1 week after the war had begun.

Today, with the price of wool having skyrocketed over \$1 per pound, this means that the 100,000,000 pounds which the Government has just authorized to be purchased will cost the American taxpayers over \$100,000,000 more than they received for the 96,000,000 pounds which were sold during the past 12 months.

Think of it, Mr. President. Since June 30, 1949, we have sold over 96,000,000 pounds of wool which originally cost the American taxpayers \$75,704,008.03, at a loss of \$11,215,000, on the basis that this wool was not essential to our national defense program. Now that the market has advanced \$1.06 per pound, we are proposing to buy this same wool back, in many instances from the same merchants to whom it was sold. This one transaction will represent a loss to the American taxpayers of over \$110,000,000.

I can understand the Government's need of wool to meet its military requirements today. I can understand that these needs are greater today as a result of the outbreak of the war in Korea than they were anticipated to be 12 months ago.

But I do not understand, if wool is a strategic material of such importance that, in addition to buying our current requirements, it is necessary to stockpile additional inventories, why it was not so classified last year or 2 years ago when the Government had substantial inventories on hand.

This is just another example of where millions of dollars could have been saved had the bureaucrats in charge of the program exercised proper judgment. Perhaps it is this stupid policy which explains why we find our boys fighting in Korea without adequate supplies, notwithstanding the fact that over \$57,000,000,000 has been spent by our Military Establishment during the past 4 years. Perhaps it accounts for an article which appeared in the same paper in a column

which was headlined: "Washington is caught off guard again; it fumbles for new plan."

CONFERENCES OF THE PRESIDENT WITH  
PRIME MINISTER ATTLEE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, apparently the Senate is about to recess, unless the distinguished majority leader has other measures he wishes to take up. Earlier today, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], who is not presently on the floor, asked unanimous consent that a resolution offered by him be referred to the proper committee and asked unanimous consent that it be treated as a privileged matter, and be brought back for consideration by the Senate not later than Friday of this week. I wonder whether we could not have unanimous consent to that request now, in the absence of the Senator from Missouri. That would take care of the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know anything about the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair was not here at the time, but the Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, in order that it might be considered tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I am the one who made the request. At that time, no member of the Foreign Relations Committee was present. The acting majority leader said he would like to have an hour or two in which to take it up with members of that committee, and that if the request were renewed later in the day, he might be able to give the answer. As minority leader, I asked that the resolution lie on the table temporarily, at the same time stating that this request would be made later in the day, after there had been an opportunity for consultation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Chair, will the Senator from Nebraska state briefly the purport of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. The resolution offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] contained certain provisions admonishing the President that, in the event any agreements were made with a foreign power, they should be made in compliance with the constitutional processes. There would be, I think, a question of advice and consent, more than anything else. The Senator from Missouri did not request immediate consideration of the resolution. He asked that it be referred to the proper committee, which I think is the regular procedure, and which I think should be done. He then asked, however, because of its importance, that it be treated somewhat as the resolution (S. Res. 368) submitted by the Special Committee To Investigate Interstate Crime was treated here a few days ago, and that it be reported back not later than Friday, if possible, in order that it might be given consideration by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair feels that this resolution should be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the request of the minority leader that something in the nature of an appendix be attached to the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes—that it be reported back to the Senate for consideration not later than Friday of this week.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, that presents another interesting and very serious question, it seems to me. I do not want to take on the obligations or duties of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and before a resolution of that kind is acted upon it would seem to me we ought to have a quorum call. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations ought to be here to defend the position of that committee. He may agree to it, but I doubt that he will. I think it presents one of the most serious questions to come before the Senate. I am not sure that I understood the full purport of the resolution. I say candidly that I was not present when the resolution was offered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to say on behalf of the majority leader that he was not on the floor earlier in the day when this matter came up. It came up at the time the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] had the floor. At that time, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] offered the resolution, and I think it was his intention to request its immediate consideration. However, I felt that in all fairness to the committee, it should be referred to the committee, and then come back to the Senate for consideration. It was my view that in that manner consideration of the resolution would be expedited. So, at the conclusion of his remarks, the Senator from Missouri asked that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that it be reported to the Senate as a privileged matter not later than Friday of this week. The acting majority leader, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], then made a statement in almost the same words used by the majority leader just now, namely, that he would take the matter up with the chairman of the committee. I said that was agreeable to me. I suggested that the way to do that was to request that the resolution lie on the table temporarily, and that, at some time later in the afternoon, the Senator ask unanimous consent to have it handled in the manner I have indicated.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the importance of the subject and the lateness of the hour, it seems to me the resolution could well lie over until tomorrow. In the meantime, the present occupant of the chair [Mr. McMAHON], who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, could confer with the chairman and other members of the committee, and decide what should be done about it. I shall more or less abide by the decision of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WHERRY. It is understood that tomorrow, after the Senate convenes, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] may again make his request. I hope by that time the members of the Committee on

Foreign Relations will have been consulted with respect to the subject, and that it will be possible to handle the resolution in the manner suggested. I think it is a fair request. There is nothing contained in the resolution which requires a hearing. It is a question of judgment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Inasmuch as the present occupant of the chair, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, will undertake the responsibility of informing the chairman of the committee of what has transpired with respect to this subject, the Chair wishes to be certain that he understands exactly what is desired by the Senator from Nebraska. Does the Senator from Nebraska desire to have the resolution referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the committee be directed to report on the resolution, favorably or unfavorably, by Friday of this week?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be the Senator's motion tomorrow?

Mr. WHERRY. It will be in the form of a unanimous-consent request, because I do not wish to displace the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator's thoughts, and the Chair will communicate them to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McMAHON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, to be Chairman of the International Development Advisory Board;

William C. Foster, of New York, to be Administrator for Economic Cooperation;

Richard M. Bissell, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Administrator for Economic Cooperation;

Henry G. Bennett, of Oklahoma, to be Technical Cooperation Administrator;

Walter S. Gifford, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Great Britain;

Howard H. Tewksbury, of New Hampshire, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Paraguay;

Sidney H. Browne, and sundry other officers and persons for appointment and promotion in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Reports of committees are in order. If there

be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

#### DIRECTOR OF PRICE STABILIZATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael V. Di Salle, of Ohio, to be Director of Price Stabilization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to state that there is no objection to bringing up any other nominations on the calendar, except that before any further nominations are brought up we should have a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator refer to the nomination of Michael V. Di Salle to be Director of Price Stabilization?

Mr. WHERRY. No; that nomination has been confirmed. There is no objection to bringing up any other nominations, but before doing so we should have a quorum call.

Mr. LUCAS. It is a little late to have a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely wanted to make that statement.

#### RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, December 7, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 6 (legislative day of November 27), 1950:

##### NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

John Thad Scott, Jr., of Texas, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1954. (Reappointment.)

##### UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

*To be sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance*

Euald C. Warkentin

*To be junior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance*

Edward J. Martin  
George J. Gruber  
Albert B. Ripley

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

*To be senior scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective September 29, 1950*

Leslie A. Chambers

*To be junior assistant pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective November 24, 1950*

John W. Toole

*To be senior assistant sanitarians (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated*

Harold Wainess, November 2, 1950.  
Darold W. Taylor, November 8, 1950.

*To be senior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective November 2, 1950*

Mary G. Demiani

*Surgeons to be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective dates indicated*

Allen B. Eschenbrenner, September 28, 1950.

William J. Brown, September 28, 1950.

Ralph W. McComas, September 29, 1950.

James A. Smith, October 2, 1950.

Frederick G. Gillick, October 13, 1950.

Louis Jacobs, November 6, 1950.

Carl L. Larson, December 26, 1950.

*Senior assistant surgeon to be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective October 25, 1950*

Arthur E. Rikli

*Assistant sanitary engineer to be senior assistant sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective October 11, 1950*

Ronald G. Macomber

*Junior assistant sanitary engineer to be assistant sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective October 11, 1950*

George W. Burke, Jr.

*Nurse officers to be senior nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective October 31, 1950*

Lorena J. Murray	Elsie T. Berdan
Ellwynne M. Vreeland	L. Margaret McLaughlin
Zella Bryant	lin
Esther A. Garrison	Ruth I. Gillan

The above-named officers were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

#### IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral:

##### Rear admiral, line

Wallace R. Dowd	Walter E. Moore
Hugh E. Haven	Burton B. Biggs
Calvin M. Bolster	Lyman A. Thackrey
Ralph E. McShane	Grover B. H. Hall
John P. Womble, Jr.	Lorenzo S. Sabin, Jr.
Byron H. Hanlon	Walter G. Schindler
Robert F. Hickey	George L. Russell
Ruthven E. Libby	Milton E. Miles
Thomas H. Binford	William S. Parsons

##### Rear admiral, Medical Corps

Bertram Groesbeck, Jr. Carl A. Broadus  
Herbert L. Pugh Joseph B. Logue

##### Rear admiral, Supply Corps

Charles L. Austin

##### Rear admiral, Dental Corps

Daniel W. Ryan

#### IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Gerald C. Thomas	Edward A. Craig
Henry D. Linscott	Christian F. Schilt

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James P. Riseley	William J. Scheyer
Gregon A. Williams	Albert D. Cooley
Frank H. Lamson-Lewis	B. Puller Scribner
	Robert O. Bare

#### POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

##### ALABAMA

Billye S. McElroy, Livingston, Ala., in place of L. A. McLean, deceased.

##### ALASKA

Norma A. Anderson, Craig, Alaska, in place of B. J. Jensen, declined.

Nancy E. Parker, Spenard, Alaska. Office established January 1, 1949.

##### ARKANSAS

Cecil Charles Walker, Eureka Springs, Ark., in place of H. H. Fuller, deceased.

Orval E. Faubus, Huntsville, Ark., in place of Hugh Murphy, transferred.

##### CALIFORNIA

Robert F. Osmann, Escondido, Calif., in place of H. E. Crenshaw, retired.

Ellis C. Allsop, Maywood, Calif., in place of G. E. Archer, resigned.

Virgil M. Ringue, South San Francisco, Calif., in place of J. P. Quinlan, retired.

##### DELAWARE

Francis Allyn Cooch, Jr., Newark, Del., in place of C. E. Rittenhouse, deceased.

##### FLORIDA

Jackson F. Ritch, DeLeon Springs, Fla., in place of T. L. Latimer, not commissioned.

Edward F. Thrasher, Seffner, Fla., in place of C. D. Wheeler, deceased.

##### GEORGIA

Henry Ward Beecher Collins, Collins, Ga., in place of P. E. Cody, transferred.

##### HAWAII

Lei Pansy Pickard, Hauula, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

##### IDAHO

Bennie D. Harmon, Dubois, Idaho, in place of J. W. Hays, retired.

Jimmy H. Christopherson, Hazelton, Idaho, in place of F. M. Heistand, resigned.

Archie E. McKinley, Kellogg, Idaho, in place of G. A. Needham, resigned.

Willis J. Lyman, Rexburg, Idaho, in place of G. A. Hoopes, deceased.

Leland W. Stanford, St. Anthony, Idaho, in place of W. J. Andrasen, deceased.

##### ILLINOIS

James H. Sneed, Creal Springs, Ill., in place of M. W. Robertson, retired.

John A. Weber, Lottant, Illinois, in place of Ambrose Harth, retired.

Roy H. Dawkins, Jr., Louisville, Ill., in place of C. E. Farrell, transferred.

Lowell L. Taylor, Metropolis, Ill., in place of I. H. Mitchell, transferred.

Frances H. Pembroke, Monticello, Ill., in place of J. F. Hartsfield, resigned.

Curtis C. Lake, Niantic, Ill., in place of E. S. Hooe, removed.

Arthur L. Koetting, Jr., Okawville, Ill., in place of F. H. Morgan, retired.

Harry C. Shaw, Palestine, Ill., in place of O. C. Seeders, retired.

Mary M. Hackett, Polo, Ill., in place of M. J. Naylor, retired.

Everett C. Leeper, Rockport, Ill., in place of H. W. Harshman, transferred.

Frederick A. Dreyer, Steeleville, Ill., in place of L. H. Tegtmeyer, retired.

Florence M. Binkley, Warrensburg, Ill., in place of F. E. Binkley, deceased.

Everett W. Patterson, Watseka, Ill., in place of J. H. Stone, resigned.

Willard W. Cain, Woodhull, Ill., in place of F. C. Shetler, retired.

Claude E. Wedel, Worden, Ill., in place of G. C. Thornton, resigned.

##### INDIANA

Ralph L. Combs, Cedar Lake, Ind., in place of J. C. Fleck, resigned.

Walter B. Popejoy, Delphi, Ind., in place of W. H. Ashba, deceased.

Leonard Y. Cripe, Goshen, Ind., in place of E. D. Logan, retired.

Otho F. Wilson, Paoli, Ind., in place of J. M. Trinkle, retired.

##### IOWA

Lloyd D. Webb, Alta Vista, Iowa, in place of J. W. Weber, retired.

Gordon F. Williamson, Battle Creek, Iowa, in place of E. E. Carlson, retired.  
 Raymond A. Veale, Boone, Iowa, in place of J. A. Hull, retired.  
 Elbie R. Petro, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, in place of F. B. Baldwin, retired.  
 Raymond C. Formanek, Chelsea, Iowa, in place of Joseph Benesh, retired.  
 Gorman B. Howell, Clarinda, Iowa, in place of C. L. Herren, retired.  
 Earl E. Gaule, Clearfield, Iowa, in place of M. W. Palmer, deceased.  
 Reginald T. Naee, Graettinger, Iowa, in place of V. L. O'Connor, retired.  
 Paul F. Goergen, Granville, Iowa, in place of J. A. Bunkers, transferred.  
 William R. Wilson, Hampton, Iowa, in place of R. A. Fox, resigned.  
 Richard D. McCarty, Hartley, Iowa, in place of A. F. Palmquist, retired.  
 Walter E. Dietsch, Hills, Iowa, in place of A. L. Jenn, retired.  
 Edward C. Fritsche, Homestead, Iowa, in place of J. H. Eichacker, deceased.  
 Jerome E. Whalen, Jefferson, Iowa, in place of L. B. Gibbons, retired.  
 Arlie V. Otto, Johnston, Iowa, in place of A. L. Murray, resigned.  
 Lloyd M. Crumly, Letts, Iowa, in place of N. M. Parsons, retired.  
 Harlan W. Cohrs, Lewis, Iowa, in place of A. A. Smith, deceased.  
 Paul J. Vollmer, Manning, Iowa, in place of K. D. Eden, retired.  
 Henry C. Pendergraft, Mason City, Iowa, in place of A. M. Schanke, retired.  
 Doris B. Kimzey, Milo, Iowa, in place of Oliver Van Syoc, retired.  
 Mark H. Booth, Montour, Iowa, in place of D. F. Sturtz, transferred.  
 John L. Weno, North Liberty, Iowa, in place of L. J. Mehaffey, deceased.  
 Elder O. Bottolfson, Northwood, Iowa, in place of H. C. Johnson, resigned.  
 Mary A. Boldra, Randolph, Iowa, in place of Dale Fichter, transferred.  
 Harold A. Berg, Ruthven, Iowa, in place of R. A. Gleason, transferred.  
 Robert J. Balik, Spillville, Iowa, in place of Anton Balik, retired.  
 Gerald J. Svacina, Tama, Iowa, in place of John Hynek, resigned.  
 Berle G. Keck, Washta, Iowa, in place of J. G. Chapman, retired.  
 Matthew J. Blong, Waucoma, Iowa, in place of C. E. Lynch, retired.

## KENTUCKY

Parker D. Moore, Bardwell, Ky., in place of B. P. Edrington, deceased.  
 Donald McDonald, Hardyville, Ky., in place of B. B. Davidson, resigned.

## LOUISIANA

Dan W. Graves, Bogalusa, La., in place of R. E. Richardson, resigned.  
 Loy R. Gaar, Dodson, La., in place of T. N. Stovall, retired.  
 Arthur H. Prevey, Elizabeth, La., in place of S. C. Knight, resigned.  
 Etna C. Ducote, Hackberry, La., in place of A. M. Terral, deceased.  
 Thomas F. Mahaffey, Jennings, La., in place of C. C. Mahaffey, deceased.  
 Clifford Duplechin, Mamou, La., in place of S. E. Tate, retired.  
 Tilon M. O'Bier, Shongaloo, La., in place of A. C. Burns, retired.

## MAINE

John A. Merriman, Sedgwick, Maine, in place of C. B. Means, deceased.

## MICHIGAN

Hazel D. Harrison, Conklin, Mich., in place of Floyd Harrison, retired.  
 William O. Kelly, Flint, Mich., in place of D. L. Treat, retired.  
 Stella A. Ritchie, New Troy, Mich., in place of E. E. Ritchie, resigned.  
 Valentine R. Smith, Saugatuck, Mich., in place of A. G. O'Neal, retired.  
 Russell K. Kilpatrick, Vermontville, Mich., in place of M. A. Mahar, transferred.

## MINNESOTA

John A. Rolig, Center City, Minn., in place of H. H. Gunz, transferred.  
 Carl F. Ardin, Cook, Minn., in place of O. J. Leding, retired.  
 Harland E. Stierlen, Elysian, Minn., in place of N. A. Terrell, resigned.  
 John O. Barklow, Kasota, Minn., in place of A. L. Davies, retired.  
 William C. Culhane, Marshall, Minn., in place of A. P. Rose, retired.  
 Joseph D. Folsom, Ogilvie, Minn., in place of F. S. Averill, retired.  
 Fritz R. Greenfield, Pease, Minn., in place of W. F. Groenvelde, deceased.  
 Mary E. Lannon, Prior Lake, Minn., in place of J. M. Lannon, deceased.  
 Leslie J. Henderson, Roosevelt, Minn., in place of Adolph Oseid, deceased.  
 Mabel V. Lundholm, Round Lake, Minn., in place of V. B. Flentje, resigned.  
 Delbert D. Merrill, Silver Lake, Minn., in place of W. O. Merrill, retired.

## MISSISSIPPI

James W. Norwood, Amory, Miss., in place of Romie Green, retired.  
 Alonzo A. Vance, Chunky, Miss., in place of Bessie Puckette, retired.  
 John M. Allred, Collins, Miss., in place of G. B. McIntosh, resigned.  
 Julian B. Gardner, Columbus, Miss., in place of G. Y. Banks, deceased.  
 Leonard C. Gibson, Jr., Crawford, Miss., in place of C. D. Bragg, transferred.  
 George Martel Bridges, Ethel, Miss., in place of J. H. Middlebrook, resigned.  
 Rufina W. Gully, Gholson, Miss., in place of M. M. Whittle, retired.  
 Callie R. Davis, Handsboro, Miss., in place of S. F. Myers, retired.  
 Ruth Seale, Lyon, Miss., in place of E. C. Stephens, retired.  
 Grace C. Beasley, Pelahatchee, Miss., in place of B. M. Gallaspy, deceased.  
 James Q. Pylant, Purvis, Miss., in place of A. M. Avery, transferred.  
 Robert P. Barron, Smithdale, Miss., in place of D. R. Butler, retired.  
 Richard D. Robbins, Summit, Miss., in place of J. A. Jones, deceased.  
 Zeida M. Dye, Vardaman, Miss., in place of J. E. Morgan, resigned.  
 Clyde T. Furr, Wesson, Miss., in place of A. E. McGee, transferred.  
 Ira L. Moore, West Enterprise, Miss., in place of C. L. Wright, retired.

## MISSOURI

Pansy B. France, Forest City, Mo., in place of B. W. Brown, deceased.  
 Joseph O. Burchfield, Marshfield, Mo., in place of W. T. McMahan, retired.  
 Charles E. Jones, Rolla, Mo., in place of H. J. Baysinger, deceased.  
 Nelson Maness, Stark City, Mo., in place of J. T. Harrison, retired.  
 Maurice G. Lentz, Sumner, Mo., in place of M. K. Turner, resigned.

## MONTANA

Francis I. Adams, Livingston, Mont., in place of E. H. O'Connor, resigned.  
 Ralph L. Benjamin, Shelby, Mont., in place of G. M. Cox, resigned.

## NEBRASKA

Chester A. Koza, Clarkson, Nebr., in place of G. A. Koza, retired.  
 Burton E. McKee, Lyman, Nebr., in place of E. L. Denny, resigned.

## NEW JERSEY

Frank A. Brown, Arlington, N. J., in place of E. F. Rohn, deceased.  
 Gladys A. Rysinski, Cliffwood Beach, N. J. Office established May 1, 1948.  
 Dorothy B. Jahn, Mantoloking, N. J., in place of H. W. Polhemus, retired.  
 Edna M. Thompson, Mickleton, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.  
 Edward J. Brennan, Ocean Gate, N. J., in place of A. K. Moran, deceased.

Francis E. Davenport, Pitman, N. J., in place of E. R. Smith, deceased.  
 Harry F. Kolbert, Skillman, N. J., in place of M. F. Brophy, retired.  
 Fiore V. Romeo, Stirling, N. J., in place of Christof Lindenmayer, retired.  
 John F. Carroll, Teaneck, N. J., in place of J. J. Allen, removed.  
 Joseph S. Chamberlain, Titusville, N. J., in place of B. S. Agnew, retired.

## NEW YORK

Glenn O. Robinson, Adams, N. Y., in place of J. W. Cain, retired.  
 Harold James Hyland, Arcade, N. Y., in place of H. J. Hyland, resigned.  
 James W. Maloney, Aurora, N. Y., in place of J. L. Purcell, retired.  
 George W. Dedrick, Bayport, N. Y., in place of J. S. Annable, retired.  
 John J. Bohuslaw, Bay Shore, N. Y., in place of A. J. Melton, retired.  
 Fletcher R. Ward, Bemus Point, N. Y., in place of Gerald Aldrich, resigned.  
 Alleene D. Schaad, Clarence Center, N. Y., in place of K. M. Raps, deceased.  
 George A. Christensen, Clymer, N. Y., in place of J. J. Reagan, retired.  
 Arthur L. Rennie, Cornwallville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
 James W. Ansbrow, Darien Center, N. Y., in place of E. M. Ortner, retired.  
 Abraham Finkle, Far Rockaway, N. Y., in place of E. M. Fitter, retired.  
 Michael S. Valvo, Forestville, N. Y., in place of H. A. Dye, resigned.  
 Charles K. Myers, Frewsburg, N. Y., in place of A. W. Stitt, removed.  
 John D. Allardice, Hudson, N. Y., in place of A. G. Harvey, deceased.  
 Marjorie H. Schneider, Islip, N. Y., in place of E. S. Raynor, deceased.  
 Jesse J. Bridge, Madison, N. Y., in place of G. J. McGovern, retired.  
 John E. Conley, Marcellus, N. Y., in place of W. T. Conley, resigned.  
 Carmen Murano, Memphis, N. Y., in place of K. B. Kinne, deceased.  
 Norman S. Wilber, Mount Tremper, N. Y., in place of H. B. Ecker, retired.  
 Helena C. Carroll, Oriskany, N. Y., in place of T. F. Carroll, retired.  
 James J. Sullivan, Quogue, N. Y., in place of E. H. Stevens, resigned.  
 Jeannette L. Moran, Rexford, N. Y., in place of A. R. Knowlton, retired.  
 Sim S. Garrett, Upton, N. Y. Office established August 1, 1947.  
 Fred S. Richardson, Westfield, N. Y., in place of E. N. Skinner, retired.  
 Horace C. Orton, Wingdale, N. Y., in place of J. W. Hodge, retired.  
 Thomas A. Brown, Wyandanch, N. Y., in place of C. J. McMahon, resigned.

## NORTH CAROLINA

Willie H. Smith, Rocky Mount, N. C., in place of W. L. Joyner, resigned.  
 James P. McPherson, Snow Camp, N. C., in place of N. H. Clark, transferred.  
 Kent Haynes, State Road, N. C., in place of T. A. Gentry, retired.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Mary S. Tomlinson, Benedict, N. Dak., in place of Alice Jacobson, resigned.  
 Edmond W. Green, Hankinson, N. Dak., in place of M. A. Wipperman, retired.  
 Peter N. Retterath, Lidgerwood, N. Dak., in place of A. M. Wagner, retired.  
 Walter Kessler, Martin, N. Dak., in place of V. C. Magnuson, resigned.  
 Elizabeth N. Fischer, Streeter, N. Dak., in place of Paul Kietzke, deceased.  
 Edward J. Sondag, Sykeston, N. Dak., in place of Lena Kremer, retired.

## OHIO

Gwendolyn M. Flack, Bettsville, Ohio, in place of J. W. Turner, retired.  
 Jacob Benjamin Romine, Galion, Ohio, in place of W. V. Goshorn, retired.  
 Dennis E. Hurst, Marietta, Ohio, in place of F. J. McCauley, retired.

Fred A. Luhnnow, North Madison, Ohio, in place of E. C. Brown, resigned.  
 Florence V. Needler, Poland, Ohio, in place of J. M. McCrone, resigned.  
 Verdi C. Von Thron, Port Clinton, Ohio, in place of A. W. Kalb, retired.

## OKLAHOMA

Martha V. Cowan, Cache, Okla., in place of L. M. Norris, transferred.  
 Bob W. Johnson, Durant, Okla., in place of Ralph Ownby. Incumbent's commission expired.  
 Paul Hampton, Hinton, Okla., in place of E. F. Lyon, resigned.  
 Elsie V. Fulfs, Randlett, Okla., in place of P. R. Fulfs, deceased.

## OREGON

Donald B. Estes, Coquille, Oreg., in place of M. O. Hawkins, retired.  
 Elva G. Varnum, Crater Lake, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Warren E. Horrocks, Blooming Glen, Pa., in place of H. R. Shaddinger, retired.  
 Joseph K. Brown, Blue Ridge Summit, Pa., in place of M. F. Birely, retired.  
 Michael C. Barone, Bryn Mawr, Pa., in place of P. W. Lukens, resigned.  
 James H. Taylor, Sr., Canton, Pa., in place of O. S. Williams, retired.  
 Charles J. Zuerl, Jr., Irvine, Pa., in place of J. J. Myers, retired.  
 John J. Fox, Ivyland, Pa., in place of A. C. De Hart, resigned.  
 James A. Barkley, Latrobe, Pa., in place of J. P. Doherty, deceased.  
 James E. Clark, Leechburg, Pa., in place of J. A. Sproull, resigned.  
 Frank H. Glenn, Lemont, Pa., in place of J. C. Hillman, resigned.  
 Keat P. Heefner, Mercersburg, Pa., in place of H. E. Trout, retired.  
 John H. Reuther, Muncy, Pa., in place of L. D. Sedam, retired.  
 Fred E. Slick, New Florence, Pa., in place of N. J. Brendlinger, deceased.  
 Joseph V. McGrory, Norristown, Pa., in place of M. B. Marr, removed.  
 Mary R. Vincenti, Plainsville, Pa., in place of L. M. Bennett, retired.  
 Elizabeth M. Foreman, Pulaski, Pa., in place of V. R. Nosik, resigned.  
 Freda L. Riley, Salisbury, Pa., in place of D. H. Broadwater, resigned.  
 Robert Schneider, Scenery Hill, Pa., in place of G. C. Wonsetler, retired.  
 Theodora R. Renner, Secane, Pa., in place of O. M. Hardican, removed.  
 Sarah V. Webster, Sewickley, Pa., in place of J. D. Webster, deceased.  
 Robert C. Powell, Swarthmore, Pa., in place of A. P. Smalley, retired.  
 John C. Hess, Three Springs, Pa., in place of C. W. Hess, transferred.  
 Elizabeth S. Whitesell, Washington Crossing, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.  
 Paul C. Klapp, Watsontown, Pa., in place of M. M. Beagle, retired.  
 Charles L. Johnston, Waynesboro, Pa., in place of W. A. Thompson, resigned.  
 Henry F. Sickler, Jr., Westtown, Pa., in place of B. S. Farrell, removed.  
 Samuel R. Klinger, Wiconisco, Pa., in place of C. E. Minnich, retired.  
 Thomas G. Wilt, Woolrich, Pa., in place of M. G. Johnston, resigned.

## PUERTO RICO

Margaret R. Keith, Aguirre, P. R., in place of Jenaro Vasquez, removed.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Sam W. Lytchfield, Jr., Bonneau, S. C., in place of C. M. Mitchum, transferred.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

LaVerna L. Marshall, Draper, S. Dak., in place of Emma Peterson, retired.  
 James W. Sweaney, Sturgis, S. Dak., in place of S. M. Blair, resigned.

## TENNESSEE

Andrew J. Frazier, Bon Aqua, Tenn., in place of Katie Potts, retired.  
 Ted L. Rozell, Chapel Hill, Tenn., in place of Frank Rickman, retired.  
 Charles H. Settle, Gainesboro, Tenn., in place of J. C. Sadler, deceased.  
 Vesta C. Locke, Mount Juliet, Tenn., in place of R. V. Cawthon, retired.  
 Charles R. Byrn, Murfreesboro, Tenn., in place of W. F. Earthman, deceased.  
 James A. Britton, Whitesburg, Tenn., in place of S. C. Roberts, transferred.

## TEXAS

Ethan L. Upshaw, Belton, Tex., in place of E. A. White, transferred.  
 Claude B. Lynch, Jr., Como, Tex., in place of M. L. Garvin, Jr., retired.  
 Joe B. Chastain, Emory, Tex., in place of F. R. Allen, retired.  
 Thomas J. Agnor, Marshall, Tex., in place of B. C. McElroy, retired.  
 Bonnie F. Goldsmith, Needville, Tex., in place of M. C. Warncke, transferred.

## UTAH

Alva G. Boman, Lewiston, Utah, in place of J. M. Bernhisel, retired.  
 Arvin L. Bellon, Roosevelt, Utah, in place of J. A. Pack, retired.

## VERMONT

Fredric L. Pierce, Barnet, Vt., in place of H. A. Somers, retired.  
 Frederick L. Kemp, Craftsbury, Vt., in place of J. C. Litts, resigned.  
 John P. Dudley, East Montpelier, Vt., in place of C. P. Dudley, retired.  
 Reginald F. Pelow, Lyndon, Vt., in place of M. K. Paris, retired.

## VIRGINIA

Hicklen B. Quillen, Jr., Gate City, Va., in place of B. B. Cox, retired.  
 Charles T. Braswell, Norton, Va., in place of J. C. Litts, resigned.  
 Moffett E. Bibb, Jr., Weyers Cave, Va., in place of J. S. Hinegardner, retired.  
 Mayo H. Worrell, Zuni, Va., in place of Percy Bradshaw, retired.

## WASHINGTON

John P. McMonagle, Tacoma, Wash., in place of G. P. Fishourne, retired.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Charles W. Maloney, Bradshaw, W. Va., in place of William Perkins, resigned.

## WISCONSIN

Richard P. Koenigs, Campbellsport, Wis., in place of W. J. Sullivan, resigned.  
 Richard E. Graichen, Coloma, Wis., in place of H. A. Parkin, retired.  
 Norman W. Helgoe, Durand, Wis., in place of A. C. Smith, removed.  
 Joseph L. McDonald, Endeavor, Wis., in place of J. I. Sweney, resigned.  
 Leora C. Zeiger, Lake Beulah, Wis., in place of L. F. Mengert, removed.  
 John J. Walsh, Lannon, Wis., in place of J. J. Flanagan, retired.  
 Robert E. Myers, North Freedom, Wis., in place of Frank Hanley, retired.  
 Robert C. Davenport, Okauchee, Wis., in place of M. O. Bartelme, retired.  
 Fred J. French, Prescott, Wis., in place of William Murray, retired.  
 John G. Stoffel, Richland Center, Wis., in place of J. P. Kelly, retired.  
 Ireen L. Kennedy, Shell Lake, Wis., in place of J. S. Kennedy, deceased.

## CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 6 (legislative day of November 27) 1950:

## DIRECTOR OF PRICE STABILIZATION

Michael V. Di Salle, of Ohio, to be Director of Price Stabilization.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Gunther Plaut, Mount Zion Temple, St. Paul, Minn., offered the following prayer:

Our God and God of our fathers, in the midst of darkening skies and on the eve of a bitter anniversary of our people, we scan the horizon for signs of confidence. Of needs, our thoughts turn to Thee who alone canst provide us with sustenance for our hope-starved souls.

In a world which in the agony of its wounds and fears looks either to cynical nihilism or cheap panaceas, we thank Thee for men and women who can preserve their sense of history and proportion, who can still see man in the maze of mass, and will continue to champion his cause as a person of dignity and worth.

We pray in this hour for our valiant sons and daughters who bear our burden in far-away places. May our dedication match their devotion.

We pray that Thy support and insight may guide the men and women of this Congress. Give them the confidence to know that where they will lead with courage the people will follow in trust. Make them ever aware of the fact that sacrifice for freedom is not sacrifice, but service willingly offered—service for our country and service also to the divine goal of humanity, living in liberty.

Thus we ask Thy blessing upon their deliberations and their work. With freedom as their guidepost, may they, with Thee as their fortress, serve our country and thus the hopes of man. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 483. An act to extend the time limit within which certain suits in admiralty may be brought against the United States; and  
 H. R. 2365. An act for the relief of the city of Chester, Ill.

## THE LATE CHARLES G. ROSS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I regret to announce the death of Charles Ross, the President's press representative, at his desk at the White House late last evening. He may be considered as one of the casualties of the war.

He was one of Missouri's most distinguished sons. He had served in every professional newspaper capacity from reporter to editor of both local and metropolitan newspapers. He received from his alma mater and from other schools the highest honorary degrees which could be conferred. As the President's liaison with the press of the Nation and the world he was worth a division in the field.